THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The late Miss M. D. Petre, friend of the Roman Catholic Modernists, Father Tyrrell, Abbé Henri Brémond, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, and Alfred Loisy, had prepared before her death in her eightieth year in December, 1942, a memoir of the last-named—*Alfred Loisy: His Religious Significance*.[1] As the title indicates, it is not Loisy's scientific work as an historian which she would consider; she did not regard herself as competent for that. Rather is it the value of his religious teaching.

It would appear that while the main effort of Loisy's literary career was directed towards the historical investigation of Christian origins, his early interest in religion as distinguished from historical science remained with him to the end. Indeed it is Miss Petre's contention that the main interest of his life was a religious one, and that what really mattered in his eyes was not historical science in itself but its bearing on religion. And it is her belief that Loisy may eventually figure as one that upheld religious values in a time of crisis, and worked for the religious development of mankind.

On the point that it was religion that occupied him from first to last, she says: 'Why did he devote all his time and learning to religious documents unless this were so? After his breach with the Church he might have turned to other subjects of research; but the Gospels held him—the Scriptures, ancient and new—and while there was, to my mind, a period of severely scientific, and almost hostile temper to the Church and even to Christian faith, there was ever an inextinguishable attraction to all that concerned the history and process and actual condition of Christianity.'

Did he then, as Miss Petre is disposed to believe, uphold religious values in a time of crisis? It looks as though we might now answer yes. For it was the apologetic burden of his famous but much execrated work, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, that while history must not be denied, neither should the essential doctrines of the Church suffer eclipse. The teaching of the Church was not grounded on, proved and supported by the New Testament Scriptures. The New Testament Scriptures, on the contrary, originated within and not without the Church. The Church did not depend on the Epistles and Gospels for her truth and life, but they on her, being the utterance of her early faith, and being carried with her along the ages as she adapted herself to the spiritual needs of mankind.

It is a point which is largely conceded by the Church historian of the present day, and it leads to a revised estimate as to what is of primary, and what of secondary importance in Christian belief. The primary thing is the spiritual truth which is preserved in the gospel, the secondary the dogma and creed which are built upon the gospel. As Loisy says, 'What counts and lasts in religion is not its external forms, which are necessarily and continually variable, but the spirit which gives life to the forms, that sense of the divine which guides humanity throughout its moral striving and labour.'

It is worth observing, as we consider whether Loisy might yet be enrolled among Christian apologists, that he was utterly opposed to the writers who deny the historic actuality of Jesus Christ. In the last years of his life (he died on 1st June 1940 in his eighty-fourth year, and did not witness the surrender of his country) he entered the lists against Paul Couchoud in particular, who held that Christianity was not founded on the historic Christ, but created His history. In his *Histoire et Mythe à propos de Jésus Christ* Loisy affirmed that the mystical faith in Christ

[1] Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net.

was bound up with the historical fact of the life of Jesus Christ, and was not a product of the religious life of the early community. Thus he became an apologist in a new sense.

It adds to the significance of Loisy's religious message to mankind that we find him in his later works opposing also the false claims of science. In *La Religion*, as indeed in previous works, he rebuked the tendency of science, historical and other, to encroach upon the domain of faith. Science must not imagine that faith is an illusion. That might be said if faith were identified with the beliefs in which it has been expressed, and which inevitably become outworn. But faith is not belief, and it outlives, under new forms of religion, the religions that are dead.

He was very conscious, however, that faith must find some organ of sanction. A merely philosophical spirituality was not enough. That is why he deprecated opposition to existing religions. While he repudiated the claim of the Christian religion to finality or absoluteness, he did not want to see it destroyed. It should be allowed to stand till something higher and holier appeared. He warned Miss PETRE against accepting an invitation to the celebration of his own Jubilee until he had assured himself that it would not have an anti-clerical, sectarian character.

Other points in Miss PETRE'S memoir might be set forth, but from the above one may gather what the foundation was of her belief in the lasting religious significance of Alfred Loisy.

We not infrequently meet with books we could wish shorter; it is a rarer experience to meet with a little book which we could wish were much longer. This is true of a book by Dr. A. D. LINDSAY, Master of Balliol, entitled *Religion, Science and Society in the Modern World*.[1] It consists of three lectures delivered at Yale University which are so packed with matter and compressed in style as to make a severe demand on the attention of the reader.

The subject is so vast that it would take a great treatise to do anything like justice to it. Although not mentioned in the title the real subject of the lectures is Freedom. How is human freedom to be safeguarded and co-ordinated in its social environment in the modern world? This is perhaps the most vital practical question that faces humanity to-day.

[1] Milford; 3s. 6d. net.

One of the most strange and disconcerting events of our time has been what might be called the flight from freedom. For generations freedom was an inspiration, a watchword, a battle-cry. Byron, looking on Marathon, 'dream'd that Greece might still be free,' and many heroic souls throughout the world, looking on the manifold forms of cruel bondage that oppressed their fellow men, vowed before God,

> We will drain our dearest veins,
> But they shall be free.

And they paid their vows, and battled on till a great measure of freedom was won for men. Then there came this strange turn of the tide. In lands where freedom was in great measure won it began to be looked on as an empty and unsatisfying thing. Men seemed at a loss to know what to do with it and they began to turn hither and thither in search of some new authority, some leader who would give an absolute word of command, or some close-knit social order which would co-ordinate and control all individual activities. So it has come about that freedom, where it is not despised, is no longer honoured as once it was. Here is a prospect and a problem calling for the most serious consideration.

The ideals of the Græco-Roman world and of the Christian world were strikingly different in regard to freedom. The Græco-Roman ideal was static. It contrasted the fluctuating world of time and sense with the permanence of the real. The purpose of the State was to establish and conserve a complete and finished programme of life. 'The best State,' said Aristotle, 'is always and everywhere the same.' It was the business of the philosopher to formulate this ideal and the practical work of the statesman was to fit the individual into his proper place in it and keep him there. In contrast to this the Christian ideal is dynamic. The Sermon on the Mount is not a new code of laws. Grace far transcends law and involves free activity and individual responsibility. The new man in Christ is not to be tied down by regulations but must be free to express the impulses of the spirit that is in him. His action can never be regimented but is unpredictable and may be revolutionary. This inevitably raises in an acute form the problem of the diverse and possibly conflicting claims of Cæsar and of God, or the problem of how to find room within the settled framework of the social order for the activities of the free and creative spirit of the individual.

'The medieval world found a provisional solution of the problem in terms of the distinction between natural ethics and the ethics of Christian

perfection, and the parallel distinction between the secular and the religious life.' In other words, while all were under law, which in this case practically meant Roman law, the elect few were free to rise above it at the call of grace and strive after the divine perfection. This solution was declared inadequate and fundamentally wrong by the Reformers. 'The Reformation in all its forms attacked the separation of the secular and the religious life.' In declaring the priesthood of all believers it claimed for every Christian man full freedom to follow the guidance of the Spirit of God in all the walks of life, and denied the right of any outside authority to take from him that liberty or to relieve him of that responsibility.

This profound conception marks, in the history of human thought, the birth of a new attitude of mind which is distinctly modern. It gave rise to a restless, searching, creative spirit in man, the experimental spirit, the belief that there is more to be learned and more to be revealed. This was most clearly expressed among the Puritans, as in John Robinson's famous word to the Pilgrim Fathers that 'the Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of His holy word.' As another expressed it, 'The true temper and proper employment of a Christian is always to be working like the sea, purging ignorance out of his understanding and exchanging notions and apprehensions imperfect for more perfect, and forgetting things behind to press forward.' In due time the same claim was made in the name of science and so the modern spirit was born.

These two, religion and science, might and should have worked in harmony if only they had rightly understood the free spirit which animated them. But it was not to be. Science, beginning with the study of inanimate nature and becoming obsessed with the precision of mathematical and physical laws, grew more deterministic. It applied these rigid laws in the world of life and mind and ended in a complete denial of human freedom. The curious contradiction in his system, which the scientist quite overlooked, was this, that while he regarded all other humans as mere phenomena, puppets of fate, atoms moved by irresistible forces, he never so regarded himself. He unconsciously took himself to be an exception, a privileged spectator of this grand drama, for if he himself were but an atom in the stream then his whole science would be irrational and a meaningless dream.

While science thus went astray, religion on its part erred in other directions. It became dogmatic, losing the freedom of its spirit and seeking to bring the Christian mind into bondage. Or it became pietistic, retiring into a spiritual hermitage much as the medieval monks did, leaving the world to go its sinful way. Or it became sentimental, too dainty and refined for participating in the rough and tumble. 'In time some of their members came to thank God that they were not as other men are, even these soldiers and politicians. No doubt the soldiers and politicians did their moral dirty work for them but it was dirty work, and its existence was one of those disagreeable facts it is better not to see.'

The root of the trouble is that Christian freedom has been very imperfectly understood. Here Nietzsche may be our teacher. He makes a penetrating distinction between 'freedom *from*' and 'freedom *to*.' A man in prison may ardently long for his freedom, but being set free, if he has no home to go to or work to do, he may become an aimless and dispirited wanderer. Such seems to be the experience of modern man. He conceived of freedom too negatively, as deliverance from external restraints, as just being let alone to please himself. And he thought of the State as standing by to guard this freedom. Hence the doctrine of *laissez faire*. But now he finds such freedom empty, purposeless, uninspiring. He becomes disillusioned and cynical. He falls into moral lethargy, or if more energetic he calls aloud for leadership, and in his revulsion from this empty and idle freedom he is ready to bind himself to any authority that will give aim and purpose and value to his life.

Freedom needs to be better understood. There is no point in freedom if we do not use it to serve other people. No decent man ever wanted to be free except to be able to do his job. As our Christian faith teaches, only in God's service is perfect freedom and in His will is our peace. It is the business of religion to teach this truth and cultivate this spirit. It is the business of science in her study of human nature to accord full recognition to this distinctive element of freedom in the constitution of man. And it is the function of the State, not to override and submerge the freedom of the individual, but on the contrary so to reconstitute and safeguard the social order that within it free men may have the fullest liberty to cultivate and express their personality in every legitimate way.

The New Order.

II. Personality and the New Order.

By H. D. Lewis, M.A., B.Litt., Lecturer in Philosophy at University College, Bangor.

The idea of 'Respect for Personality' is one with which we have been made very familiar in recent discussions of social and political issues, especially in public exhortation. 'To make use of other persons,' is, again, a phrase that is often used in condemnation of wrongful acts. But it is clear that we are entitled to the service of others in certain regards, and, indeed, it may also be said that individuals have a right to be used, a right which is violated, for example, in cases of chronic unemployment. Can the idea of respect for personality, then, be made more precise? Or shall we dismiss it as a popular cry arising from confusion of thought?

It is urged in this paper that the idea of the special worth of personality is very relevant to the problems that confront us to-day, in particular the problem of freedom. Some very tentative suggestions will also be made as to the way this principle will operate. With the more metaphysical aspect of the problem of personality we shall not be concerned.

The idea of the special worth of persons has a notable ancestry, and has become almost a commonplace of ethical thinking in the West since Kant, in a celebrated formulation of the moral law, enjoined men to treat one another as 'ends in themselves, never merely as a means.' This does not imply equal respect for every whim of an individual. Nor does it forbid us to engage the service of others for ourselves and the community. Kant himself may not have been altogether happy in his rather formal view of what we respect in the life of persons. But his own account of the 'self,' with the insistence on its unifying function, points to a more specific interpretation. For the development of this we owe to idealist thinkers a debt that is most inadequately acknowledged at the present time.

It was largely owing to these idealist thinkers, and especially, in British Philosophy, to T. H. Green, that the idea of personality was seen to have special relevance to social and political questions. On their view it was the function of the State to provide the opportunity for the development of the distinctive capacities of persons. And the substitution of this view for the assertion of inalienable natural rights has been hailed as a principle 'which in its main outline still stands by its own mass as the solidest contribution since the time of Locke to providing a formula "adequate to the action of reason as exhibited in nature and human society, in art and in religion."'[1] Such is the estimate of one of Green's disciples, J. H. Muirhead, who also quotes a German writer, Dr. Klaus Dockhorn, to the effect that Green's doctrine was 'a radical departure from the whole line of English political thought for the last hundred years, with the possible exception of Burke's,' and 'a truly revolutionary and secular turning point.'[2] To determine the soundness of these claims we have to consider more closely how personality is to be understood here.

In the case of Green himself, as of many of his followers, the worth of personality was apt to be understood in terms of the strictly moral qualities of character. This led to excessive concern for the kind of freedom that is directly presupposed by responsibility, namely absence of restraint. And thus, in regard to any practical issue, we find Green in the closest alliance with Mill and other individualists from whom, in theoretical matters, he especially wished to be distinguished. Witness the diffidence with which Green advanced his moderate educational reforms, the opposition to the Poor Law on the ground that it interfered with individual responsibility for the poor, the trifling with the question of a 'dispossessed proletariat' while insisting that 'free play should be given to every man's powers of appropriation.' The real problem, apparently, is to ensure 'the emancipation of the individual from all restrictions upon the free moral life.'[3] And the most that is claimed for this doctrine is that it offers a new 'ground' or 'justification' for an attitude which it does not seek to modify—the *laissez faire* of the nineteenth century.

It is not idle to recall this at the present time. For there persists in our thoughts and practice a strain of old-fashioned obstructive individualism. In making these strictures we do not deny that

[1] *John Henry Muirhead*, ed. by J. W. Harvey, p. 159.
[2] *Op. cit.*, 159 note.
[3] *Principles of Political Obligation*, Section 220, Lecture N. It is instructive to note the close similarity between the basis of Green's individualism and that of some of the most celebrated economists of his century. Marshall, in particular, regarded the claims of the moral qualities of character as invariably an overriding consideration.

individualism had its usefulness. It helped to break down unnecessary restrictions and extended to the masses many privileges that had been jealously reserved for the few. It is none-the-less a one-sided theory, and has stood in the way of much positive reform. It reveals itself to-day, not merely in economic matters, where it has the support of vested interests, but also in cultural and educational spheres, in the continued assumption that there should be no attempt to influence men in their beliefs or to give any particular turn to their characters. This is the abnegation of responsibility against which the nonconformist conscience has to be always on its guard.

The most deplorable feature of this negative view is the cover which it offers to the more malicious obstructiveness of those sections of the community who have more regard for their own privileges than for the progress and pacification of society. The persistence of such an attitude, in complete disregard of the signs of the times, is as surprising as it is distressing. Of its strength there is much evidence, and if the complacency observable in certain quarters remains undisturbed at the end of the war we may well find ourselves embarking on the tasks of reconstruction in an atmosphere of civil war.

How, then, can we arrive at a more positive view of social enactment? Has the idea of personality relevance here?

We shall do well to note at this point the other extreme against which we have to be on our guard—totalitarianism. In one respect, no doubt, we are fully alive to this menace. But there are many subtle forms of totalitarianism, and the conditions of modern civilization are not unfavourable to their emergence. Industrialization, extensive combines and mass production, the uniformities imposed by modern entertainments, the influence of the films, radio, the press, and the more overt forms of propaganda, induce a habit of taking men in the mass rather than as persons with a life of their own. This is considerably heightened by the exigencies of war. And the comprehensive planning which reconstruction requires, involving much extension of the State's responsibility, is fraught with the same dangers. Can we achieve our more positive aims without regimentation?

Here, then, is our Charybdis. And it is not uninstructive to consider how much there is in common to individualism and totalitarianism. Both are extremes, and they are therefore, simple, easy to understand and apply. Hence their initial attractiveness. They both also depend on a false view of the individual whom they treat as an isolated unit not fundamentally different from countless others—at any rate for the purpose of social and political enactment. Within the circle which individualism draws about each one, in seclusion and privacy, we may, it is thought, exercise our private tastes and live our lives in very different ways. But this is too abstract a view. It is only in contact with others that these varieties of taste and interest develop. Abstracted from his fellows the individual is a very dull creature, and it is likewise the vitalizing contact of one man with another that is stultified and muffled by totalitarianism, overt or disguised.

It is as a corrective to this idea of the abstract individual, and the extremes it encourages, that we resort to the notion of respect for personality. And our clue to the meaning of this principle, as it bears on the problems of practice, is found, not in any particular activity considered in its distinction from others, but in that unity of rational experience as a whole of which Kant offered so supreme an analysis, but which he did not himself relate to the problems of character and conduct. The application of this principle to art will no doubt be evident. But the idea of an integrated experience, of 'the whole man' as it has been well put, while it will not provide a panacea for all evils, will substantially help us to see our problems more clearly when we have to make delicate adjustments and strike a difficult mean.

It is not possible here to go into the full implications of this view. But we can indicate some of the ways in which it will have a special application to practice.

(1) The first point that emerges out of our view is that the distinctive spiritual activities of persons depend on the power of the individual to integrate his experience according to his own bent and situation. This does not mean that value is variable and relative. All that is implied is that the attainment of value depends, not indeed on our whims, but, nevertheless upon factors which are private and processes for which the initiative of the individual is indispensable. We only attain to the truth through the exercise of our private judgment, artistic activity depends on the exercise of private taste, morality depends on the conscientiousness of our will, religion on the devotion of the worshipper. It follows that these activities of the mind and spirit cannot be directly produced or enforced. This hardly requires to be stressed.

(2) In the second place, the creative character of spiritual activities, while it precludes their being mechanically induced and directed from outside, renders them uniquely organic to their environment. This has special importance for us. For it shows how little the individual is sufficient unto himself. The plea for a 'return to nature' and the abolition of all restraint, whether it arises among the Cynics and Stoics of the second century

B.C., or in the early thought of Rousseau in the eighteenth century, or in these latter days among the followers of Tolstoy, has been effectively anticipated by Plato when he insisted, in the *Republic*, that a soul may be made or marred by its environment, that it requires to be 'nurtured' much in the same way as a plant, on which we cannot impose a particular form, will only flourish in the right soil, climatic conditions, etc. Social institutions cannot be neutral. As W. E. Hocking reminds us,[1] the acceptance of one principle by society almost always leaves others at a disadvantage. If this were not the case, principles would have no value. The question is not as to the fairness of discriminating against some belief or social tendency but as to the quality of the interference and its methods. In the words of Professor Hocking, is the penalty which an unsuccessful principle pays a 'relevant penalty'? But decisions of this kind are not made by rule. 'Practical Wisdom' comes to a community, and to its leaders, in the measure in which they maintain their feeling for spiritual matters and their acquaintance with what is most creative in the history and achievements of men hitherto. This is our safeguard against the distortions and vulgarities of propaganda as well as the indifference which will not bear the responsibilities of active interference. And if this seems not to take us very far, at any rate it shows us what we should be seeking, and that we must always be seekers.

It hardly requires to be added that our immediate community is a feature of special importance in our general environment.

(3) Finally, the different modes and levels of the experience of individuals cannot be segregated. The more material aspects of existence come under the operation of principles which govern the higher reaches of life in art, morality and religion. And thus the meanest tasks have a spiritual character.

This has very extensive implications. But we can do no more here than add the following comments.

(*a*) This principle helps us to appreciate the complexity of freedom and its significance. It is because it comprehends so much that freedom is hard to define. It has many forms; individual freedom; the freedom of groups and nations; the freedom of States; within these we distinguish freedom of opinion, freedom of moral choice, religious freedom, freedom from material want, etc. Indeed there does not seem to be any feature of our lives, whether viewed in its social or its more individual aspect to which the idea of freedom has no application. It is this, in particular, that accounts for so many conflicting views about its meaning. Men have allowed their preoccupation with some particular kind of freedom to dim their appreciation of its importance in other regards. To the same source ultimately may be traced more deliberate abuses of the idea. Oppressors have not been slow to avail themselves of the camouflage which may be thrown over acts of despotism and spoliation by exaggerating and distorting the importance of freedom in some limited province, where it is at the moment not incompatible with their purpose. It is thus that the individual is sacrificed to the freedom of the community, and the freedom of one community, perhaps of a very small minority, becomes the excuse for the enslavement of multitudes elsewhere, and the jeopardizing of precious values. To the ambiguities that arise from the varied fields to which freedom has application, must also be ascribed much of the despair of those who honestly present the ideas of 'order,' 'discipline,' and 'authority,' as the more fundamental conceptions for social reconstruction.

The true corrective to these lapses, whether they spring from genuine disappointment or from malice, will be found in the habit of mind which thinks always of freedom as Plato thought of 'Justice' in the *Republic*, not as an idea with a particular sphere or department, but as something which 'spreads through the whole,' the whole of individual life and the whole of society. We shall thus never lose hold of the need to make continual delicate adjustments, to moderate our claims in the light of what is attainable on the whole, to be tolerant of conflicting claims, and, above all, to realize that reconstruction is not a matter of a few mechanical readjustments, to be accomplished in one heroic effort, but the setting of ourselves in the way of living more in harmony with ourselves and our environment by the exercise of an intuition that comes only to those who continue to think. An understanding of the complexity of freedom appears to be especially necessary at the present time, both for leaders in responsible positions and for the community at large. And here the idea of the wholeness of personality is especially instructive.

(*b*) To the same source we must turn for our view of the relation of means and ends. The society which we hope to realize in due course must be a free society. But the means by which the end is attained is also important. The means qualifies the end whenever we are dealing with any reality that is vital and growing. And the society whose development is forced upon it, instead of being elicited from within, can never become a free society. It can never be a true medium for the things that matter most in the lives of its individual members. This is a principle that has frequently been disregarded in recent

[1] *The Lasting Elements of Individualism*, 76 f.

times. The more obvious violation of it is found in the uprooting by oppressive rulers of entire communities and the transportation of millions of human beings regardless of their own reactions, their traditions, and their environment. In some respects regrouping was perhaps desirable, but the means by which this supremely difficult task was undertaken undermined all possibility of a fair and permanent settlement. Neither have the democracies been always sufficiently alive to the importance of the methods by which reforms were attempted. These methods must, therefore, be reviewed in the light of the ideals which we hope to see progressively realized in our society. The simplification of an immediate task must not be allowed to jeopardize our ultimate aim or disrupt the continuity of social progress. Here also there is need of the spirit of the whole. But it does not follow that we must always wait for ideal means.

These conclusions bear on many topics which could not be brought within a brief discussion—the 'rule of law,' national self-determination and the task of creating a democracy that depends essentially on consultation and discussion. Suffice it here to reaffirm in a general way the relevance of the 'worth of personality' to the problems of reconstruction. The special significance which this principle derives from religion, and especially the Christian religion, must be left to other contributors.

Literature.

THE MEANING OF HISTORY.

Prophets for a Day of Judgment, by Canon A. E. Baker (Eyre and Spottiswoode; 4s. 6d. net).

In this thoughtful book Canon Baker has, as the Archbishop of Canterbury says in introducing it, invited us to consider what aspects of our faith are specially relevant to such a time as this. These have been more or less evident in the lives of some of the great servants of God in the past. The 'prophets' mentioned are Jeremiah, Augustine, Julian of Norwich, and Dostoevsky, and in all cases it is the doctrine of salvation through suffering that is proclaimed. The most interesting chapter in the book is the last in which the author expounds 'The Gospel for a Day of Judgment.'

It is the gospel of love. But of course as soon as that is said the question inevitably rises: Why then is love so helpless? Celsus threw this jibe at the Christians, and he only echoed the spectators at the Crucifixion: 'if he be the Son of God let him come down from the cross.' Why did God do nothing? Why *does* He do nothing? We have an answer in Easter, but does this answer cover everything? In particular, does it explain and vindicate God's omnipotence? Canon Baker is brought up by this question, and his answer is that God's omnipotence is love. It is not coercive, irresistible, able to compel all creatures. There is no evidence for such a God, he says. It would mean that God so limited Himself that in history He is in fact not omnipotent. That would make the problem of evil intolerable and in experience has been the parent of unbelief.

Also, it is not Christian. For if Jesus is, as we claim, the ultimate revelation of God, we must interpret all the divine attributes in terms of the ministry of Jesus. That is the significance of the discussions on the person of Christ. Their real problem was not to find who Jesus was so much as what God is. It is therefore Jesus Christ who gives content to the Christian theory of divine omnipotence. History, Nature, and philosophy are distractions and by-paths except as they are interpreted by the clue supplied by Him.

There is a difficulty here. What of St. Paul's statement in Philippians about Christ 'emptying Himself?' Canon Baker will have nothing to do with any 'kenosis' theory. He is quite fierce about it and insists that the supporters of a 'kenosis' doctrine seem to know what God is apart from the revelation of Himself in Jesus and can decide which of the divine attributes He renounced and which He retained. The 'kenosis' theory is, Canon Baker says, 'pure mythology,' and he gives a paraphrase of the passage himself which eliminates the 'kenosis' but which will commend itself to few students of St. Paul as a fair rendering of his words.

Does Canon Baker help us very much by his assertion that the actual Jesus of history, above all in His cross, is 'the visible human concretion and actualization of the awful infinity of divine omnipotence?' Calvary, he says, is the end of history, the crown of creation, the ultimate event. We joyfully agree to this, but when he goes on to say that it is also the meaning of God's sovereignty, that there is no omnipotence in God but that of love, can we feel that much light has been thrown on our darkness? It is true that love has its in history in spite of the apparent victories of evil. It is even true that while evil was victorious at the Cross this was the way to God's greater victory. But does that not suggest that the traditional way of thinking of divine omnipotence is after all sound? God did limit Himself by the gift of freedom to man. And that means that the victories of evil were not merely 'apparent' but real, if transient. The whole issue for faith is: is God defeated? And surely the answer of faith is

that while God may (and does) lose a move, He wins the game. Canon Baker's argument does not seem to me to improve on that answer; but, while we may find his contention intellectually unsatisfying, we are his debtors for an able and earnest book. It is called a 'Lent' book, but the issue it raises is one for any and every season.

F. J. Rae.

Contemporary Thinking about Jesus, compiled by the Rev. Thomas S. Kepler, S.T.B., Ph.D., D.D. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $3.50), consists of a miscellaneous selection of chapters from the writings of over fifty modern Biblical scholars. These are arranged under five principal heads—the Nature of the Synoptic Gospels, the Portrait of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus' Relation to History, Eschatology and Ethics, and Modern Evaluations of Jesus. A great deal of the book is given to critical questions which are of more interest to the student than to the preacher. Some of the views expressed are very negative from the Christian standpoint and the whole gives a faithful reflection of the confusion of modern thought about the historicity of the Gospels. It is regrettable that so many critics in straining after what they take to be a strictly scientific attitude should be so wooden and unimaginative. After the historicity of the documents has been undermined it is hardly sufficient compensation to be told that nothing spiritual is lost. Still one must recognize that many who are radical literary critics are also characterized by their devotion to the person of Jesus Christ. The contents of this anthology as the compiler calls it are of a very mixed kind, and if his intention was to illustrate the bewilderment of modern thinking about Jesus he has fully succeeded in his aim.

Mrs. Hester Gray, M.A., has long been an acknowledged authority on Indian questions, especially those that relate to Indian womanhood. Her book on 'Modern India and the West' was adopted by the Board of Education as a handbook for men and women going to India to carry on educational work. From this book a chapter has been reprinted under the title of *Indian Women and the West* (Church Missionary Society; 2s. net). For any one who wishes a short, well-balanced and up-to-date account of this important and fascinating subject nothing better could be found than this booklet.

What the Cross Means to Me (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net) is described in the sub-title as 'A Theological Symposium.' It is not, however, a symposium in the strict sense of the word. There is no discussion. The various contributors have not been in communication with one another, but each one writes independently. There are fifteen papers in all and they present a wide variety of view. This is inevitable since 'the contributors have been deliberately selected from widely divergent schools of thought.' Who made the selection is not disclosed but we have representatives from the Church of Rome and the Greek Church, from the Church of England, and the Free Churches, from Modernist and Quaker. The papers have been arranged in alphabetical order under the names of their writers. This somewhat haphazard arrangement turns out unfortunately in giving first place to one of the weakest of the contributions, in which the writer puts forward the moral theory of the Atonement in a self-confident way without the slightest sympathetic consideration for any other view. Very different is the contribution of Dr. A. E. Garvie who, while emphasizing the truth in that theory, yet does justice to elements in the problem which the moral theory does not cover. With all the diversity of outlook and emphasis there runs through the whole a very deep and reassuring unity. The heart of the Church in all her branches responds to the appeal of the Cross, and with united voice declares it to be central and vital. This book is not only full of interest and instruction but is strongly confirmatory of Christian faith.

We have received an offprint of an article from Dr. Samuel Daiches entitled *The Meaning of 'Sacrifices' in the Psalms* (from the Chief Rabbi's seventieth birthday volume, 1944). Dr. Daiches' thesis is that when 'sacrifices' are mentioned with approval in the Psalms the reference is not to animal sacrifices, but to expressions of thanks. In our view he attempts to prove too much. There is no doubt of his being right in some of the instances he quotes—51^{19} and $69^{31f.}$ for instance. But when he would interpret 20^{4} in this way, and especially when he says that in 51^{21} 'burnt-offerings,' 'whole burnt-offerings,' and 'bullocks' are 'here only figures of speech,' he seems to us to be denying the plain sense of Scripture. Some psalmists were certainly against animal sacrifices, but why not assume that some seriously attempted to make them a true medium for praise and thanksgiving? Why should they not have 'called upon the Lord . . . with the offering of the sucking lamb,' as Ben Sirach says that Samuel did in Ecclus 46^{16}?

Dr. Daiches further holds that 'in the Psalms the altar is not a place of animal sacrifices, but of divine worship and thanksgiving.' He suggests on the basis of Gn 12^{8} that 'the altar was built not as a place for sacrifices, but as a place for worshipping and praising God.' But why, once more, this 'either . . . or . . .'? Dr. Daiches denies history. If he is wholly right, then J, E, D, P are fictions.

Dr. Henry Burton Sharman, Honorary Lecturer in the Department of History, Yenching University, Peking, has after the lapse of several decades supplemented his work on 'The Teaching of Jesus About the Future.' That study covered the time subsequent to the final severance of relations between Jesus and His disciples, and therefore excluded the study of the reputed teaching of Jesus about His rejection, sufferings, death, resurrection, and appearances after the Resurrection. It is with that teaching that the present study,

Son of Man and Kingdom of God (Harper ; $2.50), is concerned.

That teaching all revolves, in the records, about one single phrase, ' Son of Man ' ; and accordingly the first part of this volume attempts, by aid of the two-source hypothesis, to examine all those passages within which that phrase appears. The text of Mark under study occupies always the central one-third of the page, with any Matthew parallel to the left and any Luke parallel to the right. When the passage under consideration is from some source other than Mark, it occupies one-half the width of the page for each of the books within which it is found—Matthew to the left and Luke to the right. By this plan the reader is greatly assisted in following the critical discussion under each passage.

The second part of the volume treats of the phrase, ' Kingdom of God,' the other outstanding phrase within the synoptic teaching of Jesus. It is strange that there appears to be no relationship between the two phrases. The Son of Man has no Kingdom and the Kingdom of God has no Son of Man, except for two passages in Matthew and two in Luke. But as a result of his critical examination of those passages Dr. Sharman is of opinion that the study of the usage of the second phrase should go forward quite independently of the previous study of the usage of the first phrase. Tabulating the various passages according to the system above indicated, he gathers the material for critical examination under such headings as the immanence and the nature of, and the time element in, the Kingdom of God.

It is no constructive exposition of the two concepts that he offers, but a critical basis for the scientific expositor. Undoubtedly his work is worthy of serious consideration.

For three years an Australian clergyman has broadcast every Sunday religious addresses. They have been published under the title, *Everybody's Calvary*, by the Rev. Alan Walker, B.A. (Epworth Press ; 5s. net). The addresses are thoughtful, appealing, interesting. They are well illustrated by incidents from the preacher's own experience. The subjects are striking—The Benefit of the Doubt, Holding the Pass, The Other Side of Silence, God a War-time Casualty, Claustrophobia. One of the most arresting is the one chosen as the title, ' Everybody's Calvary.' But the talks are all good and would be useful as seeds of thought and preaching.

A series of addresses which are meant as training for church membership is contained in *Things Concerning the Kingdom*, by the Rev. Alexander McCrea (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net, paper covers). The subjects are such as these : Jesus and God, What Nature Tells, God and Suffering, Progressive Revelation, God in Jesus Christ, The Teaching of Jesus on God and Man, on Sin and Salvation, and Conditions of Growth. The class that listened to these addresses, and discussed them, was well prepared for church membership. They are good addresses, well thought out and simply expressed.

The late Rev. Anthony C. Deane, Canon of Windsor and Chaplain to the King, has written several popular books of introduction to the Bible, designed to enlighten the plain man on the interest and value of the Scriptures and especially the Gospels. These books have had a wide circulation and a warm welcome, for Canon Deane had the gift of a light as well as a cultured pen. His latest book, and one of the last we shall have from his pen, will therefore be received with hope and read with pleasure—*The World Christ Knew* (Eyre & Spottiswoode ; 5s. net). Its subtitle is ' The Social, Personal, and Political Conditions of His Time,' and the subjects are : The Galilean, A Troubled People, Stones into Bread ?, The People's Religion, Leaders and Centres of Religion, Home Life, Public Opinion and our Lord, Some Books and Views.

Ever since Dr. Glover wrote his famous ' Jesus of History ' books on the background of our Lord's life and that of the Apostles have been multiplied. And this is all to the good, for they have not only made the New Testament intelligible but they have made it interesting. Canon Deane was one of these benefactors. He studied the classic works on the conditions in Palestine and also those that are more recent, and his latest book is full of enlightenment for the average reader of the Bible. The last chapter on books provides not a mere list of books but a discussion of the merits and contributions which they contain.

The custom of issuing a book for Lenten reading, which has for some years been honoured in the Church of England, has led to the production of a number of excellent little books of devotion. More recently the Congregational Church has followed the same course, and its most recent issue is *The Drama of the Cross*, by the Rev. C. Stanley Herbert, B.D. (Independent Press ; 5s. net). Dr. Sidney Berry in a Foreword says, ' This book is not meant for Lenten reading only. It is in a way the Congregational devotional book for the year.' The various chapters are devoted to studies of the principal actors who appear on the scene in the day of the Cross. This gives a vividness and historic interest which such devotional books often lack. The writer has a happy knack of modernizing the characters he depicts and of illustrating his points by apt quotations. The book will be found to provide interesting and helpful reading.

Some time ago a selection of sermons with a memoir of the author, Bernard Lord Manning, was published. The author was a remarkable personality and the sermons reflected the qualities of the preacher's insight, sincerity, and intellectual grasp. A further selection has now been made and published under the title, *More Sermons of a Layman*, by Mr. Bernard Lord Manning, M.A. (Independent Press ; 6s. net). This is a welcome

publication. We cannot have too much of what is given us here. The sermons are delightful reading, original, evangelical, simple, and direct. The lay standpoint gives a freshness and unusualness to the religious appeal. Those who enjoyed the first sermons will eagerly accept this new gift, and those who did not happen on the former ought not to miss these further discourses.

The Rodborough Bede Book (Independent Press; 4s. net) is an addition, by an anonymous compiler, to the growing list of service books for Free Church use. It provides ministers with a wide range of short responsive offices that can be fitted in among the hymns, prayers, readings, and other items of the order of worship. Except in the case of occasional offices like those for Baptism or Burial there is no building up of the complete order of service.

A Bede Book is to be here understood not so much as a collection of prayers as a volume of 'offices.' This volume falls into two parts, of which the first is for public worship, and the second for church meetings. The material in the first part is arranged under the rubrics Fore Bedes, Mid Bedes, End Bedes, and the Sacraments (to which are added Bridal Bede, Burial Bede, and a Service of Remembrance).

Presumably the compiler is a minister of the Congregational Church. He has shown himself a diligent student of liturgies old and new. He has also shown much independence and ingenuity in the form in which he presents this 'Bede Book.' We commend it highly as an interesting and useful publication, and not the least valuable part of it is the original matter it contains.

Friends o' Mine or Down Our Way, by Winifred Rawlings (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), is a little book of 'reminiscences of mission work in the slums.' The writer after twenty-five years of work as a nurse in the slums has many touching stories to tell of the faith and courage of simple and obscure folk who have carried bravely on through poverty and adversity. Some of the stories are perhaps too highly coloured by a vivid imagination, but on the whole they are well told with a sympathy and love which will touch the reader's heart.

A book which is primarily aimed at helping the development of the Youth Centres being organized by local authorities under the Government's circular No. 1486 has been written by Miss Désirée Edwards-Rees, M.A., F.R.Hist.S., Youth Officer of the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire, Member of the Youth Advisory Council, and of the Church of England Youth Council—*The Service of Youth Book* (Religious Education Press; 3s. 6d. net). The various offices which the writer holds are mentioned as showing both her technical qualifications and, particularly, her interest in the religious standpoint.

The book is a thorough piece of work, based on wide experience and informed by a broad and generous spirit. It is also inspired by a genuine conviction of the place of religion in youth service. Every aspect of youth work is dealt with here in a masterly fashion, especially the problems raised by the organization of clubs, camp life, sex, training in leadership, and the qualities of 'John' and 'Jane,' their idiosyncracies and prejudices. There is a valuable list of books at the end of the volume and, generally speaking, there is guidance on all aspects of this great venture for the youth of our land. The headmaster of Uppingham describes this as a 'striking book' and predicts that it will be recognized as a landmark.

Professor W. Robinson of the Chair of Christian Doctrine and the Philosophy of Religion in the Selly Oak Colleges has written a brief account of what he thinks will be the main form of religious organization after the war—*The Christian Front*. We shall not have the large buildings and the big congregations but house meetings, private and limited. Dr. Robinson tells us how these small congregations or house parties should be gathered and how worship should be conducted in them. There are to be cells of Christians, and personal evangelism will have a conspicuous place. The Church after the war will be a small body in a pagan society and its activities will be of a missionary character. The pamphlet can be obtained from Professor Robinson, Overdale College, Selly Oak, Birmingham, price 2d. post free.

The Rev. James Norman, M.A., Archdeacon of The Herbert, North Queensland, has issued a *Handbook to the Christian Liturgy* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). It is the product of much learning and industry. Without any apology or explanation it plunges *in medias res*: 'When our Lord Jesus Christ, having gathered his disciples round him to supper on the night before he suffered death, solemnly broke bread before them and blessed a cup of wine and gave them to his disciples, he enjoined them to continue this thenceforward as a continual memorial of his death and passion undergone for the redemption of the world.' It might have been more precisely phrased, but it serves to introduce the reader to a careful account of the vast and various liturgical development arising out of the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Part I. is of the nature of Introduction and gives an account of the rise of the regional rites and of their characteristics, the formal differences between the liturgies being clearly tabulated. Part II. is Commentary. After an account of preliminary and preparatory rites from the comparative point of view it goes on to describe, also from the comparative point of view, the Mass of the Catechumens, the Mass of the Faithful, and the Anaphora.

The student of liturgies will find this a very convenient and, as our impression is, a very reliable book of reference.

A life of Jesus for young people which can be unreservedly commended is *Born King*, by Miss

Phyllis Saunders (S.P.C.K. ; 4s. net). The story is told vividly and simply, and behind the writing lies a great deal of study. The skill with which the writer has worked into the narrative the results of her reading is admirable. Teachers and parents might take note of this as a book that will be invaluable for instruction. A feature of the book which calls for special mention is the number and quality of the black and white illustrations. In addition, at the end of each chapter are suggestions, and guidance, for what is called 'occupation,' which means 'expression work.' And, finally, there are a chart of the four Gospels and a harmony which will also be found useful. This book is a 'find.'

'An Experiment in Christian Teaching, Citizenship Training, and Comradeship' is a large claim for the enterprise described in *The Junior Church and Club*, by Mr. P. G. Hummerstone (Stockwell ; 1s. 6d. net). The experiment is an interesting one. It is suggested that young people might conduct their own religious service in the absence of fathers and brothers in the Services. They can have their own committees, their own club, and generally carry on a church organization. Apparently the scheme has been in operation and successfully, in spite of 'the adverse criticism of one or two old-fashioned adults,' and if any one is moved to inquire about the details they are all here in this little book.

In a book, *Christian Advance, Ideas and Plans for Local Action*, by Mr. Hugh C. Warner (S.C.M. ; 2s. net), the author advocates in a warm-hearted way the formation of groups for discussion and action. He furnishes counsel and programmes for such groups and hints on the kind of problems that will arise and on how to tackle these. This is a book full of enthusiasm. It is a book for the individual and for the Church, for the parson and the layman. If Mr. Warner is not himself a parson he has an unusual insight into the crowded character of the parson's week. He gives a detailed account of each day of such a week which will open the eyes of the average layman. But the whole little book is well worth reading. It will furnish not only inspiration but guidance and help to all earnest church workers.

Russia is a many-sided enigma which seems likely to occupy the human mind for generations. There has just come to hand a book which makes a real contribution to the understanding of the problem. Its title is *Three Russian Prophets*, by Mr. Nicolas Zernov (S.C.M. ; 8s. 6d. net). The three prophets are Khomiakov, Dostoevsky, and Soloviev. A lengthy chapter is devoted to each of them, giving a valuable account of their life and thought and of their relation to one another. All were devout members of the Orthodox Church and we are made to realize the profound influence of that Church on the minds and hearts of those who could appreciate the significance of its symbolism. Basing themselves on profoundly Christian principles these men were able to criticise Western civilization in a singularly penetrating way and foresee with uncanny insight the catastrophe towards which it was hastening. They believed that the Orthodox Church would yet become the centre of Christian unity and the supreme agent for bringing in the Kingdom of God. It remains to be seen whether this faith will be justified in history, but their reflections on the subject are profound and deserving of serious consideration. Not the least valuable part of this remarkable book consists of two chapters on the Russian Background and the Future of Christian Civilization which introduce and sum up the teaching of these modern prophets. The whole book is instructive and thought-provoking in the highest degree.

Either . . . or Theology.

By the Reverend T. Hywel Hughes, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., Swansea.

Karl Barth has succeeded in stirring the dovecots and causing considerable flutter among theologians and even among philosophers. Those who are most antagonistic to his views—and there are many—have had to admit that he has done great things, and that, in many points, his teaching has been like a blast of invigorating air, freshening and stimulating the life of the rather sedate and antiquated halls of doctrine. If he had done nothing else, the religious world owes him a heavy debt for his revival of the dignity of preaching and magnifying the vocation of proclaiming the Word of God. He has, also, forced the Bible and its teaching to the front in the task of proclaiming that Word. At the same time it must be frankly confessed that his system is, in large measure, a retrogression. This, in itself, is no decisive condemnation, for it is evident to many that what the religious world of to-day needs is to get back to Christian fundamentals, to rethink principles, to survey afresh basal doctrines, and to get into more intimate and fuller touch with the truths of the gospel as stated and implied by Jesus Christ. But here is the rub. Barth in some aspects of his teaching has gone back beyond Jesus Christ, whilst in other aspects he has not got back as

far as our Lord, but has been content to abide with John Calvin, and here, in some respects, he out-Calvins Calvin. With regard to the first point, the foundations of much of Barth's teaching are laid in the Old Testament rather than in the New. To a small group of scholars who came together to meet Barth in Edinburgh some eight years ago, I heard Barth say that he did not think it right to speak of God as 'Father.' We should rather regard Him as 'Judge.' This position takes us back to the less ethical ideas of the Old Testament. But it is not wholly fair to the Old Testament, for we find there hints and suggestions of nobler ideas of God than the conception of Him as Supreme Judge. In reality the foundation of Jesus' conception of God's Fatherhood is laid when Hosea proclaims the love of God as determinative. Much of Barth's teaching bears out his Old Testament sympathy, for in the main, holiness or justice is regarded as the dominant attribute of God, whilst the legal and covenantal relations are emphasized, rather than the relations of Fatherhood and Sonship. With regard to the second point, it might almost be said that what Barth has really done is to hark back to the orthodox position as held and stated by John Calvin. Most of the basic principles of Calvin's Institutes are accepted and taught, whilst in some cases the emphasis is stronger and more unyielding than in the Master Himself. But to return to Calvin is not necessarily to return to Christ and to Christianity. In reality Calvin's system, in spite of its profound hold on Protestant European thought, was in many points at variance with, or alien to, the teaching of Jesus. This was so more especially in the ideas of election and predestination; but Calvin's conception of the Sovereignty of God is one that is difficult to reconcile with Jesus' idea of God's Fatherhood, difficult also to square with the idea of the moral individuality of each man and his worth in himself as well as his worth to God. Calvin's thought in these matters —and there are others—is not in line with the ideas and principles that lie at the basis of the gospel of Jesus Christ. There is much that is valuable and true in the Barthian theology, but it is clearly 'a theology of Crisis,' a child of the critical, bewildering, staggering thought and life of Europe after the last war.

It is not my purpose to examine the position of Barth as a whole. I propose to dwell rather on the either . . . or attitude in theology, a point which Barth has revived and emphasized. This theology rests on the effort to dichotomize the world of truth and thought into two precise and definite sections, and on this basis to make a similar division in all life and conduct. When the position is pressed back to God, He is regarded as having created a similar division in the Universe which grows to be thought of as two separate and opposing kingdoms. In the later Jewish thought, as reflected in the Bible, there comes in, through Persian influence, a dualistic conception of good and evil kingdoms—the head of one being Jehovah and the head of the other Satan. It is probable that to a very large number of Christians, especially those of certain shades of thought, the position is practically the same as that of the Persian system, for to them Satan, or the Devil, is almost, if not quite, equal in power to God. He can thwart God's purpose, curb His will and defeat His plans. This is vaguely the faith and hope of most Christians, and to many men their working faith or their implicit creed approaches the dualism already mentioned. This may be due, to some extent, to the influence of Augustine, for through him Manichæism—which was of Persian origin and in which dualism found expression in its most objectionable form—came into Christian thought and coloured the stream of theology for many centuries. Now it is on the background of some such dualism that what may be called 'the either . . . or theology' finds its basis and its expression. It cannot be said that it is a definite system of thought; it is rather an attitude of mind, a method of procedure, a principle of belief. But it can be asserted that it flourishes on dualisms in thought and finds sustenance in a dichotomy of the Universe such as dualism implies. In its theological implications it is a theology of alternatives, and the alternatives are so clear cut and definite that the one excludes the other root and branch as it were. There can be no third term, no middle way; it is either Yes! or No! Such a position is the resting-place of inflexible and fixed minds, of a logical and over-certain judgment, and of an ultra dogmatic attitude to truth. Now although there is not a specific theology of this attitude or a definite school—for it has never attained the dignity of a school—the attitude is brought to bear on almost all the major points of theology, as well as on the broad principles of Christian life.

With regard to the idea of God, it finds its incidence on the question of the knowledge of the Eternal. This may be illustrated by the attitude of Barth, who puts a great gulf between the knowledge of God and all other knowledge. The former breaks in on man—a flash, or an illumination direct from God. It can only come by revelation, by a self-disclosure of God, infused or catastrophically pressed in on the mind and spirit. All other knowledge, apparently, comes through the operation of the mind itself, in its normal or ordinary activity. It is man-made, and as such, has little—if indeed any—value in relation to God. So philosophy and science, although they may give

insight into laws and principles of the world-process, are of no value in the personal knowledge that is obtained in religion. It is either knowledge by revelation and divine impact, or it is no knowledge that can be called religious in the full sense. Now the attitude of indifference or antagonism to philosophy is an old one in the Church. The cleavage is deepened through Tertullian who was an avowed enemy of all philosophy and pushed to an extreme the either . . . or attitude. It was deepened still further in the early centuries by the necessity of definitely choosing the Christian view and refusing the prevailing paganism. There could be no community between Christ and demons. The matter was driven still deeper through persecution, for the question was Christ or Cæsar, the Lord or the Emperor. This attitude reacted on theology, and its effect can be traced throughout the Christian centuries with varying emphasis. It is found deep in the theology of Ritschl, and Barth has accepted and definitely taught it, for he regards the discoveries of science and the speculations of philosophy as of little value in the field of religion and religious truth. This position accentuates and deepens the gulf in the realm of truth which men in the progress of thought have throughout the ages been endeavouring to bridge ; it perpetuates the idea of a split world of truth, whereas men have sought and are still seeking a unity of truth. It must be admitted that there are differences between religious truth and other aspects of truth, but the differences are within the unity of truth and not different unities of truth, or distinct and separate wholes of truth. Further, we must believe that all religious truth is, in the final issue, a matter of revelation. It comes by the self-disclosure of God to the mind and heart of man, made possible by the relation of the human spirit to the ultimate spirit of the Universe. The mistake here is to suppose that this is only true of religious knowledge. Can we not believe that He has made a disclosure of Himself in the laws and principles of His creation, in the guidance and control of history, and in the deep experiences of the soul of man ? If creation is an expression of His will, then created things must surely reveal something of His nature and purpose, and the discovery by men of the laws and the traces of purpose in the Universe must yield some measure of the knowledge of God. Moreover, in the search, the minds of men acquire fitness for the disclosure which God has to make. Is not this fact a revelation of His character and of His sense of values ? Really in the search for knowledge the mind of man and the disclosure of God must work together in a unity of purpose and a consecration of aim, and that is so in every realm of knowledge. We should regard this co-operation as ' both . . . and ' rather than ' either . . . or.' It does not make good sense to imagine God on one side of the gulf and man on the other, unless we also imagine that man is seeking and doing his part to cross the gulf, as well as God. If this is so, then the exact either . . . or attitude breaks down and must be surrendered.

With regard to the Incarnation, the attitude is either Christ is God, or He is man only and the fact of the existence of Unitarians in these days proves that the alternatives still exist, and that the ' or ' has its advocates. The position appears in history in the various heresies with regard to the Person of Christ, for the question at issue is that of either divine or human. Arius took one side, Athanasius another, for however Arius may seek to exalt Christ, his views, in the ultimate, make Christ a man, a created being, and therefore separated from God.

The Church did its utmost to insist that the either . . . or did not hold. In spite of all attempts to establish the position, she clung to the two elements in the Person of Christ, and later, when the question arose of the relationship between these two elements, she succeeded in asserting the reality of the two natures. The whole problem would have presented a different aspect if the several leaders had stressed the unity instead of the distinction, for in reality it is not a case of either . . . or, but of both . . . and. Not one or the other nature or personality, but both, God and man in Christ, God as man, living within the limits and experiences of human life, and this possible, because there is a kinship between the two. It is a case not of disparity, but of community of nature, not of essential difference but of a measure of unity.

In other words, the either . . . or statement or principle again fails us and we find relief and a more assured faith in both . . . and. Christ is both God and man. So the cleavage runs through most theological questions, and at all points the result is disastrous for the validity and the unity of truth. We note its influence in other doctrines of the faith ; indeed scarcely any have escaped the incidence of the either . . . or attitude or division. It established itself in the Church as the theory that she alone is the channel of salvation, and outside her borders there is no grace or mercy. This was but the natural growth of the either . . . or attitude. We cannot but feel that this attitude in theology and its repercussions on religious life and conduct have been harmful to Christian progress. It was largely at the basis of the persecutions, it perpetuated divisions, multiplied schisms, and was one of the chief causes of religious wars. It prompted good and great men to commit deeds unworthy of the religion they

thought they were defending, as in the notable case of Calvin's attitude to Servetus.

What can we say regarding the either . . . or attitude? First we may say that the attitude appears to be opposed to the essential spirit and ideal of Christianity. The essence of Christianity, as we have it in Jesus, is one of comprehension rather than exclusion, of adaptation not rigid monotony, of mercy and grace rather than law. All such stiff, precise and unbending positions and doctrines as the attitude implies savour more of the Old Testament background of thought than of the more kindly and gracious truth of Jesus Christ. This leads us to the second point. It is doubtful whether we can find this position at all in Jesus Christ. There are traces of it in St. Paul, but it would be difficult to find it in Christ. We have His Parable of the Sheep and the Goats and of the two ways of life, both of which appear to uphold this position. But we must remember that the two gates and the broad and narrow passage is based on a Jewish prototype which goes back to the First Psalm, whilst there are points that mitigate the apparent severity of the sheep and goats division. It deals with some who were inside the kingdom, and the distinction is not therefore between those who are either inside or outside the fold. Further, the distinction is between those who have loyally done service to others for Christ's sake, and those who, professing the same loyalty, have not lived it out in service to others. It is difficult thus to regard this parable as giving Jesus' sanction for the either . . . or position. His attitude is made clear in a different set of incidents and facts. He speaks of one man being 'not far from the kingdom of God.' He was not inside, but on the borders and evidently only a step was needed to bring him inside. So the definite, clear-cut and deep 'either . . . or' theory is not easy to accept on this showing. His attitude is clearer in another case. His disciples came and told Him of a man who was casting out demons—doing the work which the disciples had been sent out to do—but this man did not belong to their group. To them Jesus says, 'He that is not against me is on my side.' So He shatters the man-made distinctions and groupings. It is impossible to reconcile this saying with any real insistence on the either . . . or principle. He spoke great words of praise about John the Baptist, yet he was not of the kingdom. He was, however, inside the circle of God's good men and belonged to the limitless fellowship of great souls. There are other sayings, but sufficient has been said to show that we cannot find much ground for an either . . . or attitude in Jesus Christ.

Again, and this is the third point, we can say definitely that the alternatives on any 'either . . . or' theory are not exhaustive and do not cover all the possibilities. There are degrees of spiritual realities, grades of character and conduct, and stages of belief. It needs an all-knowing mind to see and understand them all, whilst the possibilities of error in any deep-seated distinctions made by men are very numerous. We may well believe that God's eye sees 'half a broken inch of faith,' as Robert Louis Stevenson calls it, and that in the heart of Jesus the trembling and hesitating response of a half believing soul finds an echo.

> For the love of God is broader
> Than the measures of man's mind,
> And the heart of the Eternal
> Is most wonderfully kind.

We cannot imagine the God of Jesus—the Father of men—condemning or rejecting men because their belief is wavering and uncertain, or excluding them from His kingdom because they cannot see truth clearly or choose the right road. He prizes what little good He can find, values incipient faith, and seeks to foster and develop it into fullness. 'A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench.' In a growing world and in the sight of God who desires and fosters growth, imperfect souls are precious, and He will deal tenderly with such souls.

Bradley in his *Appearance and Reality* deals with degrees of truth and of reality. Jesus recognizes degrees of faith and loyalty. The world of spiritual realities contains not only black and white, and God's perception of that world is not covered by these two colours only. There are varying shades and combinations that reflect the more gracious aspects and attitude of His mind. So it is not either black or white, but black and white shading off into greys and other possible combinations. The 'either . . . or' attitude has little room for love and grace. It emphasizes justice, and the background is more or less legal. But in a world where moral growth is possible and spiritual perception gradual, it is the joy of the Father's heart, the perfection of love's delight to find traces, even though they be faint, of such growth. Human frailty is estimated differently by love than by law, for in the former realm distinctions are made, and alternatives presented that are impossible in a realm of sovereignty based on justice or logic merely. In the final issue the 'both . . . and' theology is richer and more Christian than that of the 'either . . . or' theory.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.D., Flemington, Victoria, Australia.

'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'—He 13^{8}.

Do you remember the inscription on the wreath that General Macarthur placed in the shrine on Anzac Day? Here it is: 'To the Anzac Forces, from their American Comrades-in-Arms of Yesterday, To-day, and To-morrow.'

What do these words mean? Well, first of all, *they are not*, as we say, *to be taken literally*. Thus 'yesterday' does not mean 24th April, and 'to-morrow' does not mean 26th April. 'Yesterday' means 'in the past' and 'to-morrow' means 'in the future.' So that to say of the Americans that they are our comrades of 'yesterday and to-day and to-morrow' is to say they have been our friends in the past, they are our friends in the present, and they will be our friends in the future.

Now, it is the last part of this inscription that we Australians were especially glad to read. We grown-ups were very glad that the Americans were with us in the War of 1914–18. Indeed, without them we might not have won. We are very glad to have them with us in Australia now. Their funny little 'jeeps' on the roads and their stumpy Kittyhawks and great Flying Fortresses in the air give us confidence and hope. And we are especially glad to have them tell us that they intend still to be our friends in the harder times ahead. Even when the war is over we shall need their help.

Now, when I read those words of General Macarthur's inscription I remembered some words in the New Testament about the Lord Jesus—'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.' I fancy that is where the General got the idea for his inscription. If we may judge by some other things he has said in Australia I should say that it is. In any case, I am sure that many people when they read his words were reminded of these other words—'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'

'Yesterday'—what was the Lord Jesus yesterday?—What was He like in the days when He walked the roads of Galilee and went to Jerusalem? Well, St. Peter tells us that 'He went about doing good.' That is, He healed the sick, opened the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, made the lame walk and comforted the sad. And all because when He saw these needy folks, 'he was moved with compassion.' His great big heart overflowed with love and sympathy. That's what the Lord Jesus was 'yesterday'—kind and loving and helpful.

And 'to-day' He is still the same. And that because He is alive now just as truly as He was in the past. You remember the story of the first Easter Day—how in the morning He met Mary in the Garden and when He saw that she was crying, said 'Woman, why weepest thou?' And when she told Him, He called her by her name and a great gladness came into her heart. And again in the evening He overtook two other friends of His on the road that led to Emmaus. And when He saw that they were very sad He immediately asked what was wrong, and helped them. On His Resurrection Day His great big heart still overflowed with love and sympathy for those in trouble. Now this is the first Sunday after Ascension, the day when we celebrate our Lord's return to God in heaven. Although on that great day Jesus disappeared from the sight of men He has never lost sight of us. He still sees and loves us and longs to help us. You remember the hymn which says:

> There is no place where Earth's sorrows
> Are more felt than up in Heaven.

That means that Jesus is still the same in the present as in the past.

But what of the future? We are all anxious about the future in these days of war, for almost everything is changing. Will Jesus change? Or will He be the same *always*? Yes, He will be the same always, because He is now alive *for evermore*. Never again will wicked men be able to ill-treat Him or put Him to death. They could do that in the past when He was here, for He let them do it. But now He is beyond their reach. The grave could not hold Him down and no man can ever overthrow Him. Though all the world change, our Lord will not change. He will always be kind, loving, and ready to help those who need Him. He is 'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'

A New Kind of Aeroplane.

By the Reverend R. J. Wedderspoon, M.A., Pollokshields, Glasgow.

'Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way?'—Lk 24^{32}.

Most boys, I imagine, know far more about railway engines and motor cars than their seniors do. You could tell me all about the most recent stream-lined engines on the railway, and you are able to tell the particular make of any passing motor car at a glance. When it comes to aeroplanes, you can leave your fathers far behind in the knowledge you display. You do not require any handbook on 'Aircraft Recognition' to help you out. You know already. And, therefore, you will be very likely to know a great deal more than I do about the new 'Jet-propelled' aircraft of which we have been hearing so much recently.

This wonderful new kind of plane, with which the name of Group-Captain Whittle is associated, is able to fly without having any propeller at all, and, because it has less weight of engine to carry, to fly very fast, and to climb very high. An aeroplane without any propeller—that is something to engage our attention indeed!

Now I am not an engineer, but I think I know the idea that the inventor had, and I am able to follow to a limited extent the working out of that idea. What is it that holds a train, a motor car, or an aeroplane back? Why, of course, the resistance of the air. That is why we get streamlining of engines and cars. The less resistance they offer to the air, the faster they will go. If you are able to overcome this resistance that is offered by the air, there is almost no limit to the speed at which you may go.

Now the inventor's great idea was to take the air itself, and master it. By cleverly placed inlets the air is brought into the very heart of the aeroplane, and there two things are done to it. It is *compressed* and it is *heated*. After this treatment, the air is released at the back of the aeroplane, and by this time it has developed such a force and power that, when it is expelled from the plane, it sends the plane itself hurtling forward at an immense speed. And no propeller is required at all! No furious, noisy threshing of the air! Truly a marvellous new development.

But is it so very new after all? Have you and I not known about this inventor's idea for a long time? Have we not heard about it every week? For the idea is simply this: Face up to your main difficulties and master them. Make them contribute to the strengthening and quickening of your own mind, and your own soul. Deal with them directly, at first hand. This, surely, is the teaching we have had from the Bible all the time. Every difficulty we meet, grapple with, and overcome, leaves us stronger and more powerful. Whittle took the air inside the plane, compressed it, and heated it. That which was his enemy became his friend.

We see this most of all, do we not, in our dealing with temptations? The first thing we have to do with temptation is to face up to it, *compress* it, and force it to give its power to ourselves. Wasn't it Spurgeon who said, 'I can't prevent the birds of passion from flying round my head, but I can stop them building nests in my hair.' Temptations so treated strengthen us for all our future days.

But Whittle found that compression alone was not enough. He had to add heating as well. Air that was both compressed and heated gave the new aeroplane a terrific force. And is not this just what we have been constantly told also? We need more than our own strength to resist temptations, and overcome difficulties. We need a power within us that only Christ can give. We require warmth and heat in our own hearts. No better illustration of the warmth He gives can be found than in the Emmaus story, where the two people concerned said, 'Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way?' With such a fire kindled in our hearts by Him, we too can gain and keep a new force, a lasting power, and make a great new discovery.

The Christian Year.

ROGATION SUNDAY.

Work and Credit.

'For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.'—Eph 2^{10}.

One of Paul's chief difficulties as a guide of souls is expressed in the word 'boasting,' of which he has almost a monopoly in the New Testament; as verb or noun it occurs more than fifty times in his letters, whilst the other writers together use it only four times. The Jew has always been something of a braggart—clamorous, assertive, fond of strong colours and a central place, but others than Jews incline to boast and strut. As Aldous Huxley says, 'boasting is delightful, it is bliss to feel yourself superior to the other fellow,' and Paul everywhere found in men this obstinate tendency to assert themselves in their religion. Without denying to God some place in their salvation, they would not acknowledge it as entirely His; something they must cling to as their own—actions, dispositions, achievements, on which they could stand. In his early Journals Charles Wesley relates how the godly Moravian, Böhler, once asked him what reason he had for hoping to be saved, to which Wesley answered, 'because I have used my best endeavours to serve God,' at which Böhler shook his head and said no more. Wesley adds, 'I thought him very uncharitable, saying in my heart—Would he rob me of my endeavours? I have nothing else to trust in.' That is deeply human, and it is what continually baffled Paul.

1. 'We are His handiwork': 'He has made us and not we ourselves.' When the Psalmist in his own body discerned the miracles of apt and intricate device he did not claim the credit for himself, but frankly declared, 'I will praise *Thee*, O God, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.' Whatever quality the nature of man may disclose—counsel or strength or sublimity—has been conferred, and though a man may degrade the powers which God has implanted or may make them ineffectual, he cannot possibly create them. By no amount of worry, as Jesus said, can a man make himself even a foot taller.

'He has made us and not we ourselves': to this reflection which any man might make Paul adds what is more closely personal that he was 'created in Christ Jesus.' One day, like some vagrant of the skies, he came within the sphere of the attraction of a sun, and was caught and swung into another course. It was the same Paul, but moving now in another orbit. When someone said to Carlyle, 'You are so eccentric,' he got the answer, 'Well, not so very eccentric, if you only knew my centre'; and in exactly the same way Paul asserted of his own mood, 'If I am beside myself, it is to God.' It is easy to caricature the

doctrine of the new birth and make it incredible by exaggerating the extent of the change; we have to look through the same eyes, and think and feel with the same brain and nerves, to use the same faculties and display the same fundamental temper. These are our tools with which we have to work, and whilst they are capable of being nobly or ignobly handled, they cannot be thrown aside. There is truth in George Meredith's discouraging dictum that 'love itself can light up the chambers of the heart, but it does not at once make them bigger.' Under the constraint of Christ an essentially small man may achieve notable things, talking with transforming power in commendation of his Lord and, by personal influence, redeeming a companion from moral disaster; and yet he remains a creature of limited capacity, though he is used by Christ for His great ends. For it is He who makes the difference, when man or woman is created in Christ Jesus.

In his preaching Paul continually returned to the day of his new creation, and in an interesting fashion the Church has recognized it as central and determining in his life. Other saints in the Church's year are commemorated either on the day of their birth or of their martyrdom, but Paul's Day is the date of his conversion, for then a grace descended upon him unsought, undreamed of, but irresistible. No doubt there was some history of preparation, secret influences undermining his convictions; but of these he did not speak, for the result of their working appeared to him as an act of Divine creation. In his own words, 'God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness has shined in my heart.' His conversion was like nothing less than a detail of the creation story: there was the Divine fiat and there was the immediate result: when God said, 'Let there be light,' there was light. With equal fitness He might have described it not as a fresh creation but as the completing of the first creation. When we read that 'God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul,' the words and the fact seem to be in sorrowful contradiction; '*a living soul*' when actually he is a creature dull and earthbound. But regeneration fulfils the purpose and the promise of creation, and man becomes what he was meant to be. But again in this no place is left for boasting.

Every Christian beginning bears witness not to any superiority in the man but to the greatness of the heart of Christ, for when a life is claimed and captured by Him it is not for its intrinsic value but for what He can make of it. 'Mothers are kind because Thou art,' says George Herbert, and all nobilities of human service are derived and sustained by Him. His task in the world was to make us what God, in our creation, had intended, and when He ascended on high He continued to 'give gifts to men.' It is pathetic to see people actually uplifted and pluming themselves on their superiorities of virtue and devoutness, as if these were achievements of their own. 'We are His handiwork,' says Paul, and boasting is for ever excluded.

2. But what I do is surely mine, and a just reason for congratulation. Grant that God made me, that Christ redeemed me, yet the conduct of my life has lain with myself and self-control and patience and magnanimity of mine have helped me on. Many of us might agree with Charles Wesley, when he knew no better, in thinking it uncharitable for anyone to rob him of his endeavours, for these we count our own. But Paul doggedly retorts, 'You were created with a view to good works, and God in advance prepared these for you to practise.' The good Samaritan did not pride himself because he turned aside to help the wounded man; rather, if he deserved the name of good, he counted it amazingly fortunate that on that day he travelled down that lonely road, with money in his purse to supply the stranger's need. The works, says Paul, are prepared in advance, and we, coming to the place, do them, or often, to our deep disgrace, we leave them undone.

Anyone who boasts of being a self-made man is unwittingly degrading his life, for he takes it as so common a thing that it can be managed without God. His own hand, it seems, is strong enough and his own wit penetrating enough for all contingencies, and thus the nobler part of life—its depth and mystery and majesty—is left unreckoned. This world is no irrational region in which chance or self-will can account for all, it is a place of opportunities and adaptations in which men, coming from God's hand, may find their appropriate tasks. It is not of Judas Iscariot only that it can be said, 'He went to his own place,' for Providence is not a devout imagination; and God, without whom no sparrow falls, has a place for every man, with tasks and enjoyments and disciplines to match. God might very well have fashioned creatures more gifted and more attractive than we are, but something in the balance of our nature and endowment tempted Him, and thus there came into this world of many colours a creature such as had not been seen before, who was planted in a complex of relations which was also new; and this bare fact carries with it an obligation. 'If you are not yourself,' says Thoreau, 'who else is going to be?' And one reflection of Jesus upon human life was that the Master of all men, in leaving us so much to ourselves, 'gave to every man his work.'

If a man's eyes are open to discern God in His Providence he comes, as life advances, to a temper of entire humility in regard to his own performance. It scarcely occurs to him to catch at credit or recognition, for the work so plainly was laid to his hand: when it was there waiting to be done, he says, how could I refrain from attempting it? The same God, who gave Jesus to the world and in Him has given life and hope and power, is ordering all things for me, so I am not going to boast of what I do or have done, as if this were apart from His appointing. It is 'in him we live and move and have our being,' and life is good and glad the more deeply we come into His debt who giveth all.[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 222.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

Prayer on the High Ground.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, M.A.,
EALING, LONDON.

'And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.'—Lk 6^{12}.

There is a topography of prayer. It may be found in the depths of experience. 'De profundis,' 'Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord,' and that is a great experience; there prayer can be found in its most real form. And yet it is not the only place of prayer, prayer can be along the level of life or it can be on the heights. 'Prayer on the high ground' is the subject of this sermon and it is based on the experience of our Lord. He had His continual everyday experience of communion with God, that might be called prayer along the level of life; He had His Gethsemane too, but He had also prayer on the high ground. Three special times are mentioned in the Gospels. Following on one of the first demonstrations of hostility on the part of the rulers He went up a mountain to pray, and the next day He took the momentous step of choosing and appointing disciples. Later on a seemingly chance set of circumstances brought Him face to face with a hungry multitude and He fed them by the miracle of the loaves and fishes, whereupon they would have taken Him by force and made Him a king. Here was a choice of ways, a decision to be made and again He goes up a mountain for prayer to God. And then at another great turning point in His experience, after the Great Confession and all that that meant in the working out of His plan, He took the inner circle of the disciples and went up a high mountain to pray. Is it a fair inference that on momentous occasions, faced with the greater decisions, His custom was 'prayer on the high ground?'

A physical effort was involved. There was the actual climb up the steep slopes, perhaps after strenuous days. In spite of weariness of body this determined effort to climb high! An abiding memory brings to mind a little whitewashed church in the Orkneys, set high on a hill. On a Sunday morning could be seen the groups of people climbing the hill, no other movement anywhere. And the words of the Psalm got a new meaning,

> I joy'd when to the house of God,
> Go up, they said to me.

Wartime Sundays especially in winter tell the same story, the story of human effort. Mother burdened with household cares and duties, father tired after a spell of fire-watching, yet the whole family gathered together in the pew for prayer. They might with good reason have stayed at home and been content with family worship. The physical effort was made, planning, arranging, journeying. How the Church to-day depends on that effort being made. Whatever be the geographical situation, the people have climbed the mountain and the Church stands on high ground. 'I can pray anywhere,' some one says, 'all life is communion with God.' If ever that was true it was true of Jesus and yet for Him there was a special meaning in prayer on the high ground.

A spiritual effort can be made. There are mountains in the spiritual sphere as real and as high as in the natural world. And they can be climbed. Sometimes the ascent is made alone, as when a man takes his stand on the high ground of principle. So often that means loneliness, a separation from his fellows on some question of principle he counts vital. Happier when we can climb in company. And what stories are told of comradeship, of mutual help and encouragement, of hardship so willingly endured and sacrifices so cheerfully made in the great attempts to scale Mount Everest. So friendship can attain high altitudes in the spiritual world. Again the war-time congregation comes to mind. It is smaller than in peace, but it stands on different ground. There has been an ascent in the past four years; at times gradual and almost imperceptible, at times sharp and calling for every quality of endurance. That steep bit of the path may have been faced during the preceding week in a new call for endurance or a test of courage. Take the whole nation and survey the way it has come, higher and higher to levels undreamt of in the days of peace. Prayer on the high ground of courage, endurance, and sacrifice is certainly different from the prayer of despair. The human effort, physical, and spiritual has been made.

What is distinctively religious in all this? The claim is made that God meets with us in a special way on the higher ground thus attained by the human will and the human power. Prayer in a home which has met bravely the challenge of sorrow or is enduring without complaint financial strain and hardship; prayer in a nation at a time of crisis and peril when patriotism is quickened and courage soars high; prayer in the case of men and women who have quite consciously taken the higher ground on a question of principle and are standing alone; these are all distinctive prayers and each has its own answer and reward. It would seem that God had a word for us that could only, or could more easily be said on the mountain top. The story of the Transfiguration corroborates this faith. The Great Confession had been made, 'Thou art the Christ.' That part of His task was over, was it time now to set His face steadfastly toward Jerusalem? The question was debated in prayer and the record tells us it was on a high mountain, farthest north and the highest point of the gospel narrative. The past came to His aid in the persons of Moses and Elijah, while the disciples could be taken as representing the future of the Church. The old Israel and the new were there. So the debate ran on, with them and in His own soul, and through it all, on the high mountainside was His prayer to God.

Then the voice, 'this is my beloved Son: hear him.' And when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone. No simple explanation can be given of the story nor is one needed. It is just one, the most telling and convincing, of the many experiences of prayer on the high ground. And somehow one has the feeling that the mountain was an essential part of the occurrence as if it could not have happened on the plain. That may seem a slightly imaginative reading of the narrative but what is certain is the underlying lesson that there is a human factor in the whole transaction. The effort involved, the comradeship of the climb, the sharp, keen mountain air and the feeling of exaltation; translate all these into spiritual terms and find out the special meaning and message of prayer on the high ground. An airman, years before the war, was ordered to make a flight from a northern aerodrome to London. A fierce storm was blowing against him at ground level, up at five thousand feet the wind was still strong and contrary, at ten thousand feet he found it had swung round and it brought him in record time to his destination.

Finding, following, keeping, struggling,
Is He sure to bless?
Angels, martyrs, saints, and prophets
Answer, Yes!

WHITSUNDAY.

The Inner Light.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.TH., LONDON.

'If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!'—Mt 6^{23}.

'When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.'—Jn 16^{13} (R.V.)

Without formally endorsing the Quaker doctrine of 'the inner light,' Protestantism generally in its zeal for religious freedom has laid great stress on the claims of the individual conscience to authority both as regards religious convictions and moral obligations, subject to the ultimate authority of the Holy Scriptures. But, as the literary and historical criticism of the Bible is by many mistakenly assumed to have undermined the authority of the Scriptures, the individual conscience is being exercised uncontrolled; or, even when the authority of the Scriptures is recognized, the right of private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures is asserted, without regard to any age-long or world-wide testimony to Christian truth which has been borne by the Church of Christ on the one hand, or on the other to sound methods of exegesis such as instructed, intelligent, responsible, and reverent Christian scholarship offers for guidance in this interpretation. We have a multiplication of sects, the tenets of which are a *reductio ad absurdum* of the contents of the Holy Scriptures, bringing the individual conscience as guide to faith and conduct into common suspicion and contempt. There is the danger of chaos instead of cosmos (disorder instead of order) in the moral and religious world. There is evidently need to lay stress then, as did the Reformers, on safeguards against injurious errors in morals and religion; and this we may do in tracing in the Holy Scriptures the symbol of light for truth as the guide of belief and action. Let us consider in order: 1. The Dower of the Light; 2. The Duty of diffusing the Light; 3. The Danger of the Loss of the Light; 4. The Defence in the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth to avert the Danger.

1. *The Dower of the Light.* God as the ultimate reality is the source of truth. 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.' Light is a universal and inevitable symbol of truth as darkness is of error; and we must think of truth not as theoretical but practical also. God as Light is infinite and eternal perfection, and in Him is no imperfection of error or sin. The ideals of truth, beauty, and goodness—to realize which is man's aim, hope, and endeavour after perfection, are absolute reality in Him. What access has man to that Light? No human discovery can reach Him: only as He reaches man in His self-disclosure can He be known: and He has revealed Himself in His Word, for it is His nature to reveal Himself. In that Word 'was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended (or, overcame) it not.' Let us lay stress on the alternative rendering. Man's reception of, and response to God's revelation was imperfect, but divine Light broke through man's imperfection, even His error and sin. The Holy Scriptures recognize, and Christian theology has affirmed a universal revelation in the religions of the world as well as a special in the Hebrew religion, where the Light shone with growing brightness of dawn and morning till the noontide radiance came. Jesus Christ was prepared for in lesser degrees, by Zoroaster, Confucius, Gautama as well as by the law and the prophets, which He fulfilled. 'The Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us (and we beheld his *Shekinah*, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth.' He claimed to be known of God alone as Son, and alone to know God as Father, so that He alone could reveal Him. 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life.' Christ is the standard by which even the teaching of the Holy Scriptures must be tested, and only can that doctrine be accepted which is in accord with His revelation of the Father, and any doctrine which is inconsistent must be rejected from authoritative Christian theology whatever relative value it may have had. The revelation of God in Christ may be formulated in an expansion of the Apostolic Benediction. 'The eternal reality of the love of God has been historically revealed in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is personally experienced in the common possession (*koinonia*) in the Church of the Holy Spirit.'

2. *The Duty of diffusing the Light.* Those who by faith in Christ and fellowship in the Spirit are the children of God not only receive and respond to the Light of God in Christ, but can diffuse the

Light; 'Ye are the light of the world . . . even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.' Two comments are here relevant. The divine Light which is not confined to truth for the mind but includes the whole of the divine perfection, means in men, not only illumination but also transformation, not only new knowledge but also new life, change of conduct as well as of conviction: and as such is diffused not so much in true words as in good deeds. Consequently we may infer that the individual conscience will know the will of God only as the character corresponds to that will. He knows the doctrine who does the will, even as Jesus did. The character of some men is so defective, that their conscience cannot be regarded as authoritative, as an authentic organ of the will of God: they show neither experience nor intelligence enough to have a conscience that is the divine voice and not a human echo. There are others we must respect for their honesty, fidelity, and courage, erroneous as their moral judgment may appear. It is imperative to preserve sensitiveness of conscience, as it is in individual consciences that moral advances for the community have had their start, even if it involves tolerance for 'cranks,' religious or moral.

3. *The Danger of the Loss of the Light.* Jesus was in constant conflict with conscientious men as well as hypocrites in His relentless opponents, the Pharisees; and they had not only a perverse but a perverted conscience. He did not underestimate the moral and religious tragedy involved. 'If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!' Whether the following was spoken at the time or not there is a sequence of thought. A divided allegiance to God and Mammon (the world's favours or goods) involves mixed motives, and any insincerity diverts the judgment from truth to error. Only the pure in heart can see God. The eternal Light shining in the incarnate Light will be diffused in the inner life where there is absolute love to God, and will radiate into the world. The pure heart has the unveiled face that first beholds and then reflects 'as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, and is transformed from glory to glory, even from the Lord the Spirit.' It is only by life in the Spirit that the danger of the light within becoming darkness can be averted, and the vision and transformation in the light can be secured.

4. *The Defence in the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth.* At Pentecost the third stage in the revelation of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit was reached. Jesus, as Son, in His ministry had revealed God as Father, and by His resurrection He Himself was revealed as Lord. When the fact that He had risen, for the faith of the Church, made a certainty the truth of God's Fatherhood and His Lordship, then and only then did the life of God come into the life of men as the Holy Spirit. The manifestations of that new life were zeal, power, and fellowship. For our present purpose, however, we confine ourselves to that function of the Holy Spirit on which Jesus, in promising the other Paraclete, laid stress. 'When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.' Even as the Holy Spirit is not a substitute for His real, but only for His visible and audible presence, so the Spirit does not impart new truth supplanting the old, but only such as supplements the old in bringing out its meaning, aim and use beyond what the limitations of the earthly ministry allowed, to meet the needs which the conditions of each age bring. 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.' 'He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you.' Only there can the guidance of the Spirit be claimed, when the Light of the World is shining through the record of the Holy Scriptures.

The Holy Spirit is experienced as the *common possession* (*koinonia*) of believers in Christ as Saviour and Lord, that is, in the Church as the community of the Spirit. Great as have been the faults and failures, the sins and shortcomings, the errors and follies of the actual churches, yet the real Church, as the continued creation of God by His Spirit, has been present and active in these churches. The guidance of the Spirit again in the individual believer must be in accord with the common testimony and influence of that Church, which can be discerned by the unprejudiced and impartial mind, and the sincere conscience. The progress of the Church will in my judgment depend more and more not on the dictates of independent individual conscience, but on the consensus reached by conference of the churches under the Spirit of truth whose guidance into all the truth will become clearer, fuller, and surer, as the churches realize their unity in the Church, and seek to make their inward unity manifest in outward reunion.

TRINITY SUNDAY.

The Forthrightness of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND GEO. J. JEFFREY, B.D., GLASGOW.

'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.'—Lk 8^{8}.
'This means *you*.'

Queen Victoria, we are told, used to complain that Mr. Gladstone addressed her as if she were a public meeting. One can conceive the great man, orating and declaiming till he became totally oblivious of his hearer. What a contrast to the manner and method of Him 'who spake as never man spake.' He was ever direct, piercing, personal. We can imagine how individuals in His audience, when He ceased speaking, had been gripped, haunted, smitten. After hearing Him, life could never just be the same again. Christ never left His message 'in the air.' He awaited men's verdict. He eschewed generalities. He looked into the eyes of men, saying 'This means you.'

Let us expand this simple phrase which sets forth the directness of Jesus, noting how it is true of the appeal of Scripture as a whole. Three challenges arise out of it. 'This means you, *as well as everyone else*.' 'This means you, *and no*

one else.' 'This means you, *even you.*' In other words, Jesus has a vital message for the universal heart, for the individual heart, and for the sinful heart.

First of all, the words of Jesus reduce us all, gifted or ungifted, high or low, to the same level of tremulous need. So is it with the words of Scripture throughout. The poet Crabbe, after describing the blessings of books, proceeds:

This books can do, not this alone; they give
New views to life, and teach us how to live,
Nor tell to various people various things,
But show to subjects what they show to kings.

Recall David, the King, caught in an act of sinful treachery. He feels secure. Who would dare to interfere with the privacy of a king? But, just when he feels safest, a quiet man steals into his presence with a child-like story of a ewe lamb, and as the king hurls his contempt at a deed so base, the prophet speaks—'Thou art the man. My story is a mirror I hold up to your deepest soul. Look at yourself. This means *you.*'

Pass over into the New Testament and watch our Lord dealing as trenchantly with the sons of men. Here is Simon, the Pharisee, who has heard much of Jesus and wishes to hear more. One can sense the spirit of lofty patronage with which he asked Jesus to his house. 'There now, you have had a good dinner, a thing you don't get every day. Let me hear you talk.' And Jesus *did* talk, and that in a way Simon, for one, never forgot. 'Simon, I have somewhat to say to thee.' 'To *me*? To this soiled woman, perhaps, but—to *me*!' And before He was done with the Pharisee, the proud man was made to learn that he, a master in Israel, knew infinitely less about the great human heart of God than this poor, erring woman. Truly 'the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.' Every word of the Bible, every word of Jesus anticipates the last judgment. Every time a congregation of men and women gather together in earnest worship, it were well that they should shed at the threshold every lurking idea that 'they are not as other men.' In Christ, there are neither rich nor poor, learned nor unlearned, great nor small. This word you are to hear to-day means *you* as well as every other who enters with you into the House of God.

Again, 'This means you—*and nobody else.*' How moving it is to hear a large congregation singing together, at the outset of worship, that appealing paraphrase:

As dew upon the tender herb,
diffusing fragrance round;
As show'rs that usher in the spring,
and cheer the thirsty ground:
So shall his presence bless our souls,
and shed a joyful light;
That hallow'd morn shall chase away
the sorrows of the night.

'As dew'—How often, in hallowed worship, have we felt this thing happening, the weary, parched heart within us being cooled, healed, refreshed by prayer and praise and the mystic bond of fellowship. Yes, but 'Ilka blade o' grass keps its ain drap o' dew.' 'God comes to each of us down His own secret stair.' Worship is not only corporate. It is individual. God alone can tell, as a congregation departs, what has happened in the privacy of each heart. 'He walks far who sees a word home.' No man takes away from God's House the very same impression as any other. The healing, the blessing, the deliverance, these may rise out of any part of the service. It may be the line of a hymn, comforting a heart that yearns for the presence of a son on service:

Peace, perfect peace, with loved ones far away?
In Jesus' keeping, we are safe, and they.

It may be some inspiration out of the pregnant, fruitful silence. Or how often have we gone into God's House in war time, numb in spirit, 'past feeling,' totally unable to enter into the atmosphere of worship—and He who can make waters rise in the desert and springs to flow from the flinty rock comes down, in strange ways, on such a tired, thirsty mood in cooling benediction. Or it may be some big ordeal lies ahead of us in the coming week, and some word from the Scripture lesson is illumined for us and becomes our very own. 'The Lord that delivered me out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine.' God, we learn, does not change His habits with us. What He has been, He will be. What He has done for us, He can do again, only more abundantly. This is God's word for you, here and now, for you and no one else in this church. 'This means you.'

Lastly, 'This means you, *even you*—so often defeated, driven to the verge of despair, dwelling so often in the land of regret. Here is a word for you.' While there will always be those whose attitude to God's forgiveness is one of cool indifference—there will always be those at the opposite extreme who simply cannot forgive themselves. Someone lately had a graphic way of contrasting the attitudes of the elder brother and the prodigal. The former went about with the airy confidence of a son who had a swelling deposit receipt at the bank that made him proudly independent. The latter watched a growing overdraft that was swiftly taking him towards bankruptcy. It is only some desperate situation of human need that opens our eyes to the preciousness of Christ's forgiveness. You remember the lofty way in which that efficient woman, Sarah Burton, in Winifred Holtby's *South Riding*, talked of the evangelism she imagined she had outgrown. 'To be washed in the blood of the Lamb appeared to her a nauseating exercise. Confession and absolution she thought to be an evasion of personal responsibility; redemption she considered to be a task for the individual will. Life was what each man made it.' One wonders if she talked like this after the fiery furnace of temptation through which she was about to pass.

With what moving power the words of the

hymn come over us, melting the hardness of the untaught human heart and bringing us all, after our failures and defeats, back home to God:

When the worldling, sick at heart,
Lifts his soul above;
When the prodigal looks back
To his father's love,
When the proud man from his pride
Stoops to seek Thy face;
When the burdened brings his guilt
To Thy throne of grace;
Hear then in love, O Lord, the cry,
In heaven, Thy dwelling-place on high.

'This means you, even you, *especially you*.'

Form-Criticism in the First Centuries.

By the Very Reverend R. O. P. Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Ringwood, Hants.

It seems strange that, in all the discussions about the Form-criticism of the Gospels, no appeal or reference has been made to the careful studies of literary form, which were made by writers of the first centuries of our era. Several of these have survived and are, indeed, easily accessible, being collected by Spengel, in the Teubner series, under the title, *Rhetores Graeci*. They are handbooks of the art of pleading. Their method of treatment consists in a careful analysis of the nature of statements in prose. Their authors set out, before their pupils, both the various elements which could be handled advantageously, and also the different ways in which these elements could be used. Their works, therefore, give us a valuable insight into the working of men's minds in the world and the times in which the Gospels were produced.

In comparing their ideas with those of the writers of our Gospels, we, naturally, derive most help from the more elementary treatises which these teachers have left to us. The date of their authors is to be noted: Theon, somewhere in the first two centuries A.D.; Hermogenes, in the second century; Aphthonius the Sophist, in the fourth or fifth century, and Nicholas the Sophist, somewhere in the period covered by these. To them must be added a papyrus fragment of the third century, which is an extract from some such writer.[1] These books are styled Progumnasmata, *i.e.* Books of Preliminary Training. They are what we should call elementary handbooks, and deal with the fundamental factors in the art of composition. They are, however, not treating of such decorative art as the word Rhetoric suggests to us, but with the practical art of stating one's case, and justifying one's conduct.

Each of these teachers chooses some point of his own with which to open his course. But they all proceed immediately afterwards, and before anything else, to deal with the form of statement which they call the Chreia. We may take, as representative, Theon's definition of this form: 'A Chreia is a concise and pointed account of something said or done, attributed to some particular person.' It may be remarked, at this point, that the definition exactly fits the detachable little stories, of which so much of Mark consists—which are, indeed, characteristic of the first three Gospels. This prepossession for the Chreia explains why the Gospels took a form so unlike those Lives of Christ which we try to achieve. The Christian convert needed to be thoroughly persuaded and, also, to be enabled to persuade others. Men looked for Chreias as the first necessity for these purposes, and the authors of the Gospels provided them accordingly—or recorded a selection from the Chreias which were already in vogue.

The demand for such statements, as a basis for pleading, is shown, not merely by the use of the Chreia as the real starting-point for the contemporary treatises, but also by its curious title—all the more curious because it is invariable. We should expect some such term as Anecdote to be used, at least occasionally. But these teachers always stick to Chreia, which is the common word for Need, Requirement, or Necessity. Moreover, they are careful to explain why they use it. Thus Theon says, 'It has received the special name of Chreia because it, more than any other form of words, gives guidance for conduct in various circumstances, in the same way as, although there are many poets, we give the title specially to Homer alone.' It is surely significant, too, that, whoever wrote the papyrus fragment, copied no more than the description of the Chreia—the papyrus is not broken away after it, but there follows a paragraph of quite a different kind, a marriage contract in fact. And, further, no other form has so arbitrary and significant a title given to it.

This insistence on the necessity of Chreia, as we have already suggested, casts a clear light on the formation of the brief portions which are set down

[1] Published in *Papiri della Societa Italiana*, i. 85. A summary of this is to be found in Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary* under ἀπομνημόνευμα. But the whole extract is important.

in sequence in our Gospels. But it may also be remarked that just as the Roman roads and the widespread use of Greek provided wonderful opportunities for the spread of the Gospel, so this customary cast of thought laid open a ready way for the spread of a message about a Person, which was expressed in the very form towards which men's minds were predisposed.

There is a further reason for our paying attention to the literary criticism thus current at the time. This arises out of the statement made by Justin Martyr in explaining Christianity to outsiders. He has usually been translated as describing the Gospels, or portions of the Gospels, which were read at the Christian services as 'Memoirs of the Apostles' (Ap 1^{67}). This well-known description, however, does not stand by itself. In two other places, Justin uses the same word, viz., Ap 1^{33} and 1^{66}, the passages being translated by Westcott as 'those who have written *memoirs* of all things concerning the Saviour' and 'the Apostles in the *memoirs* made by them, which are called Gospels.' Unfortunately, Memoirs has come to be treated by us as if it were a word in the singular number, and even Memoir suggests to us a lengthy article or even book. This, as will be seen, does not fit the usage of the original word. To clear the ground, therefore, we must use the transliteration Apomnemoneuma, for the singular number, in spite of its awkwardness. It is a term commonly used by the Rhetores, and is closely related by them to the Chreia. Thus Aphthonius the Sophist says, 'A Chreia is a concise and shrewd Apomnemoneuma, referred to some particular person'; Theon says, 'The Apomnemoneuma differs from the Chreia in two particulars—the Chreia is brief, but the Apomnemoneuma is occasionally told at some length; the Chreia refers to particular persons, but the Apomnemoneuma is also told on its own merits.' Again, Hermogenes says, 'The Chreia differs from the Apomnemoneuma principally in its length, the Chreia must be brief.' And the papyrus abovementioned, 'Why is the Chreia an Apomnemoneuma? Because it is kept in mind (*ἀπομνημονεύεται*) in order that it may be quoted.'

This last quotation is the only remark I have encountered, which can be taken as a definition of the Apomnemoneuma. Otherwise, the term is treated as being so commonly in use as to need no explanation. It must, therefore, be assumed that it stands for the natural form in which an incident would be remembered.

Another word which is brought into relation with Chreia, as describing a more extensive form, is Diegesis—which may fairly be represented in our language by Narrative. The papyrus fragment appears to have concluded with a comparison between the two, indicating some relationship between them. Nicholas the Sophist, who wrote, it would seem, for those who had already studied the elements, says 'Chreia is treated of after Diegesis (*μετὰ τὸ διήγημα*) because, to a greater extent than Diegesis, it admits of division into various kinds.' It would appear from this that the Diegesis was a more indeterminate form. It is also plainly a more lengthy form, as we see from its use, *e.g.*, in the Septuagint. It is evidently a collective word, and we therefore find Luke using Diegesis as his description of his own and other Gospels. Where Justin uses the plural Apomnemoneumata, thinking of the constituent portions of the Gospels, Luke uses Diegesis, in the singular, thinking of each Gospel as a whole. It may be added that Eusebius, also, speaks of the Apostolic Diegeses, apparently meaning the Canonical Gospels, though possibly including the Apocalypse under that title.

These Hellenic critics take a view of the Gnomē—Maxim or Dictum—which seems curious to us. They are careful to distinguish it from the Chreia, and put it in a separate class. Thus, Nicholas the Sophist says 'The Gnomē is a general statement containing some counsel and advice that is of use (*χρησίμων*) in life. It differs from the Chreia, though they are found under the same general and special heads, chiefly in this: the Chreia has both sayings and doings, but the Gnomē sayings only. Further, the Gnomē gives a general statement, while the Chreia invariably is referred to some person. As well as this, the Chreia arises from a particular situation;[1] the Gnomē consists of a number of words' (*ἐν πλήθει λόγων*). It is curious that though this particular writer describes the Gnomē as giving counsel concerning something 'useful' in life, 'useful' being one of the very words which are used to justify the title of the Chreia, neither he nor any one else should call the Gnomē Chreia, or put the Gnomē on a level with the Chreia. The attitude of the times was the reverse of that of ours. We view a dictum as if it had an existence of its own, apart from its author. If it seems valuable, we may be interested to find who was its author and willing to value him for its sake. But to them the maxim, however pregnant, had to come from an accredited person in order to carry the greatest weight. We can see how suitable to such an audience was Mark's Gospel, seeing that it is primarily the presentation of a person—indeed how suitable the Gospel was in each of its forms, since it did not consist of moral statements or of a philosophy which could stand on its own feet, but was the presentation of a person so great that his pronouncements were

[1] We all know how important this is in the exegesis of the Gospels.

final. This preference for the Chreia above the Gnomē may even account for the massing of maxims into groups, with an attachment to the person of Jesus and some note of time and place, which we find in the First and Third Gospels. The same preference might also explain the failure of Q or of any collection of Sayings to survive as an independent document.

The importance attached to the Chreia is revealed in another way. It was to be used as the basis for other forms. Thus Theon says, People 'give themselves practice (*γυμνάζονται*) on Chreias, by reproducing, by varying, by adding, by inverting. We expand them and compress them. As well as this, we construct and reconstruct them. The method of reproduction is obvious. Some one has told a Chreia: we try, to the best of our ability, to convey the meaning in the most telling form, whether by using the identical words or others.' The procedure is further defined by Hermogenes. 'The Chreia is handled thus: first there is a commendation of the man who said or did something; second, there is a paraphrase of the Chreia itself; third, the exposition of the general principle.'

The later (fifth-century) Aphthonius goes further, cataloguing eight different ways in which the Chreia may be worked out. Among these is that of the Parable (*παραβολή*). This is defined by Rufus (in a more advanced treatise) as 'an incident of the present day, recalled to illustrate the question under discussion,' a usage of the word which is characteristic of the Gospels, though more limited than that of the Septuagint. An example which Apthonius gives is—Chreia: 'Isocrates said that the root of education is bitter, but the fruits sweet.' Parable: 'For just as those, who work the land, plant the seed in the ground with painful toil, but gather the fruits with all the greater pleasure, in the same way, those, who exert themselves with painful toil to secure education, gain the glory which follows on it.' It is interesting to compare a Christian writer [1] who says, 'A parable is something said in an effort to put an idea before the mind's eye by means of a similar action which can be observed (by anybody). For example, the Lord's parable about the Profligate, in which He shows the sympathy of the Deity, His infinite goodness and His welcoming of the repentant.' Considering the succession of Rhetores and their being followed by these Christian writers, it is evident that the Christian use of the parable, not to mention our Lord's, was the use of a form which was in general vogue, and part of a system of thought into which Christian preaching instinctively fitted itself. Indeed, all that has here been brought forward goes to show that the constituents of the Gospels fall into the categories of that Hellenic thought which was the thought of the world. It is perfectly easy to classify and label the contents of the Gospels by these very terms—Chreia, Apomnemoneuma, Diegesis, and Parable. I venture to submit that this goes to justify my interpretation in a previous article (Expository Times, Feb. 1943) of Papias' *ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας*, not merely as 'Who (*i.e.* Peter) drew up the lessons to suit his (or their) needs,' but further as 'to suit the Chreias.' This raises a further point. It will be remembered that Hermogenes laid down, that the first step in dealing with a Chreia was to make 'a commendation of the man who said or did something.' The purpose of this practice was, presumably, to establish the prestige of the person, in order to give authority to the words or the example. It is in accordance with this practice that the collection of Chreias in Mark is prefaced by a statement (Ch. 1 *vv.*[1-11]) which is devoted to the establishment of the status of Jesus. We notice, too, how Hermogenes' initial and final stages are manifest in the Gospel of John. First, there is the Prologue, again establishing the status of Jesus. Then, illustrating the final phase, 'the exposition of the principle,' such passages as Ch. 3, *vv.*[31 ff], in which, indeed, it is difficult to be sure where the quotation ends and the exposition begins. Here, then, we have the contemporary treatment of the Chreia implicit in the whole structure of the books.

[1] The anonymous author of *Peri Tropon*, whose words are almost exactly those used by a similar writer, who called himself by the strange name of George the Swineherd!

Contributions and Comments.

Survey of Religion in a Scottish Battalion.

The battalion to which I was attached, when I made this survey, was recruited mainly from the working classes of Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire.

For the purpose of the survey I interviewed a large number of men—280 in all—with whom I discussed their attitude to religion and the Church. I interviewed Protestants only. The men answered my questions quite freely—those for example who had lapsed from the Church told me so frankly and without hesitation. I believe

the answers the men gave me were, on the whole, truthful, though a certain number, out of politeness or for other reasons would represent their attitude to religion as more sympathetic than it actually was. The proportion of those out of touch with organized religion appeared to be smaller in this battalion than in most other units. This would be partly accounted for by the fact that the battalion contained a relatively large number of older men, who were born and brought up in a generation when church-going was more common than it is now. One striking fact which emerged was that the number of those antagonistic to religion was quite negligible. With very few exceptions the men could be described as at least sympathetic. Another fact which emerged was that nearly all the men had had in their childhood some connexion with organized religion through a Church Sunday School, the Salvation Army, or some 'Mission,' and in nearly every case those who had themselves lapsed from the Church assured me that they sent their children to the Sunday School.

I endeavoured by direct questioning and other means to ascertain to what extent, if any, the men resented being compelled to attend the Parade Services. It appeared from my inquiries that the proportion in this battalion who definitely objected was so small that it could be discounted. I estimate it at less than 5 per cent. The soldier, accustomed to having his life, to a large extent, ordered for him, accepts religion as part of the scheme of things, and, as a rule, he enjoys the Parade Service, provided the hymns are familiar and the sermon reasonably interesting.

Of the 280 men whom I interviewed, the number of those who had joined the full membership of the Church was 49, or 17.5 per cent. Of these 49, 29 appeared to have retained a more or less vital connexion with the Church. Of those who had never joined the full membership of the Church, a certain number welcomed the idea of joining when I suggested it to them. These received instruction from me and were in due course admitted to the Communion Roll of their Parish Church.

It is difficult to appraise the depth and sincerity of any man's religion. The extent, however, to which a man attends Church may be regarded as, at least, an index of his interest in spiritual things.

I have divided the men whom I interviewed into three classes:

(I.) Those who, in civilian life, attended Church with fair regularity—say at least once every two months.

(II.) Those who were attending Church only at rare intervals—about once a year.

(III.) Those who were completely out of touch with organized religion.

I.	II.	III.
33.6 per cent.	26.8 per cent.	39.6 per cent.

(As already mentioned, allowance must be made for the tendency of some to exaggerate their religious interest.)

H. L. Adamson, C.F.

A Note on Luke xvi. 14–31.

This passage, which consists of some pronouncements which St. Luke says our Lord delivered against the Pharisees, followed by the Parable of Dives and Lazarus, has given trouble to many commentators. The difficulty lies first in explaining the connexion of the various sayings in *vv.*[16-18] with each other; the general subject with which they are concerned is clear, but the consecutive theme linking them into a continuous discourse seems to be quite absent, though several critics struggle to supply this. Secondly, the relevance of these verses to their context is obscure. Do they follow on the first part of the chapter, whose main drift is clear—the use and abuse of wealth—as *v.*[14] seems to suggest, and as part at least of the Parable of Dives and Lazarus which comes after them would seem to indicate? Or is there a connexion between them and this Parable which does not exist between them and what precedes them? Again, what is the message or purpose of the Parable of Dives and Lazarus? *Vv.*[19-26] seem concerned with the use of wealth and *vv.*[27-31] with Moses and the prophets.

There are one or two points hitherto overlooked which may help to clear up some of the difficulties of the passage. The first is that this is a passage to which we can profitably apply the methods of Form-Criticism. One of the lessons the Form-Critics teach us is that among other forms in which the Gospel-material has come down to us there is one which consists of a number of isolated sayings gathered together under one heading to which they all contain some reference though they have no direct connexion with each other—'groups of artificially arranged sayings' held together by 'catch-words' (Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, ch. v.). Now the Form-Critics (unknown apparently to any commentator on St. Luke's Gospel) have pointed to Lk 16[16-18] as a clear instance of such a group. A number of isolated sayings are collected under a 'catch-word' which we could perhaps most accurately define as 'The Law and the Prophets' (cf. *v.*[16]). One of these sayings is contained in *v.*[16], another in *v.*[17], and a third in *v.*[18].

But if the 'catch-word' is 'The Law and the Prophets,' what did 'The Law and the Prophets' mean to the Early Church, in whose *milieu* presumably these sayings were put into this form? The Early Church, as is perfectly clear from the record of its preaching in the whole New Testament, and the Book of Acts in particular, believed that the Law and the prophets were 'in force,' of permanent value for the Christian, primarily because they witnessed to Christ, to His Incarnation, Life, Death, and Resurrection. Now if this

was the importance attached to the Law and the prophets by the Early Church, we cannot confine the group of sayings held together by this 'catch-word' to Lk 16^{16-18}, but must also include the Parable of Dives and Lazarus (*vv.*$^{19-31}$), the whole point of which is that if 'Moses and the prophets' are understood properly they tell of One who rose from the dead, but if you do not understand them as foretelling Christ's Resurrection, that Resurrection itself will not convince you—a most topical point for the Early Church's controversy with Judaism. Cf. Lk 24^{25-27}: 'O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.' The sayings about the Law and the prophets in Lk 16^{16-18}, then, and the Parable of Dives and Lazarus in *vv.*$^{19-31}$ belong to a single group, strung together under a single 'catch-word.'

If we adopt this view, one of the most difficult points in the whole passage, the apparent contradiction between *v.*^{16} and *v.*^{17}, is to a great extent explained, because if the Law and the prophets are important primarily as witnessing to Christ it is true enough to say, 'the law and the prophets were until John' (*v.*^{16}), and yet it is equally true to say, 'it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall' (*v.*^{17}). Further on this view it is also possible for us to make a more likely guess than most commentators have hitherto made at the reasons which led St. Luke to place the Parable in its present context. Our view assumes that St. Luke found *vv.*$^{16-31}$ in a single group, collected under the heading 'The Law and the Prophets'; but if this was so, he certainly did not put it in a 'Law-and-the-prophets' context, but in a 'Jesus'-teaching-on-wealth' context, for it is preceded (16^{1-13}) by the Parable of the Unjust Steward and other similar matter, a fact which has given the commentators much of their difficulty in explaining *vv.*$^{16-18}$. Luke attempted to justify this piece of editing by prefixing *v.*^{14} (the typically Lucan ὑπάρχοντες makes it virtually certain that this is an editorial link), and probably *v.*^{15} too. The original group may have been aimed against the Pharisees who regarded themselves as custodians of the Law but refused to see the most important point in the Law—that it witnessed to Christ; but it was certainly not a commentary on their use of wealth. There was however enough reference to the use and abuse of wealth in the Parable for St. Luke to imagine, in spite of *vv.*$^{16-18}$ and $^{26-31}$, that it should appear in a 'wealth' context.

Finally, this view raises some interesting possibilities about the particular source among all St. Luke's sources (that happy hunting-ground for source-critics) to which we should attribute the Parable of Dives and Lazarus. Vincent Taylor (*loc. cit.*) suggests that in *vv.*$^{16-18}$ Luke retains Q's connexion, because very similar words appear in St. Matthew's Gospel, but in different contexts (Mt 11^{12-13} 5^{32} 19^{9}); the verbal correspondence is certainly very close, and as Matthew had a reason for dispersing the verses and Luke had none for gathering them together out of another context Q does seem the most likely source. But if we are to hold the view that Luke found *vv.*$^{16-31}$ collected in one group, we must be bold enough to suggest that the Parable of Dives and Lazarus comes from Q, and for some reason was not used by Matthew. This may seem less audacious when we consider that Lk 16^{1-13} appears to be explicable on the very same lines; *vv.*$^{1-8}$ consist of the Parable of the Unjust Steward, not found in any other Evangelist and usually attributed to L; following it, and clearly in the same group collected under the same 'catch-word,' are *vv.*$^{9-13}$ containing sayings some (but not many) of which appear in Matthew's Gospel. It looks therefore as if either L overlaps some Matthean document (possibly Q), or else Q contains material, including parables, which Matthew omitted and Luke reproduced. I prefer the latter alternative, because L is such a vague term in this particular context as to make the statement, 'L overlaps anything,' almost meaningless. It is possible, then, that in ch. 16 of his Gospel, St. Luke is reproducing two groups of Q material, one collected under some such 'catch-word' as 'Jesus' teaching concerning wealth,' and the other under 'The Law and the Prophets,' and that he has attempted to fit the latter under the 'catch-word' of the former.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Dublin.

τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων: 1 Corinthians x. 11.

Souter, in his *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, with reference to the above passage, takes τέλη in the secondary sense of 'revenues' instead of in the primary sense of 'ends.' In giving it this rendering he is almost alone among translators and commentators. The Vulgate, A.V., R.V., Moffatt, Weymouth, Twentieth Century N.T. all adhere to 'ends,' although the double plural is certainly awkward. That τέλη has the secondary meaning, both in classical Greek and in the N.T. is quite evident. In Mt 17^{25} it must mean 'revenues,' and the singular in Ro 13^{7} refers to some sort of money payment. To my mind this rendering of 1 Co 10^{11} gives a meaning to the phrase quite lacking in the ordinary rendering. A most ingenious justification of 'ends' is in Peake who says in commenting on the passage: 'The record is for their benefit who live when this age and the age to come meet (the terminal point of one is immediately followed by the initial point of the other, hence the plural "ends").' Despite this consensus of opinion I think that Souter has hit upon the Apostle's meaning. It would be interesting to have the views of your readers on this point.

P. Macpherson.

Alice, South Africa.

Paul's Thessalonian Correspondence.

I. The Accepted View.

The view adopted by most scholars is that Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians were written in the order in which they appear in our English New Testament. The historical background is reconstructed as follows: After Paul left Thessalonica, he went to Berœa. When trouble arose in Berœa, Paul went to Athens, leaving Silas and Timothy at Berœa. Apparently the latter two caught up with Paul at Athens (1 Th 3^{1-3}). They were sent back to Macedonia, Timothy to Thessalonica, and Silas on some other mission, while Paul went to Corinth.

To Corinth Timothy came with a report of the work in Thessalonica and possibly with a letter from the Thessalonians concerning certain problems in their church. To deal with these problems Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians and sent it probably by Timothy. Upon further report and further inquiries, Paul wrote 2 Thessalonians a few weeks later. Both of these Epistles, then, were written from Corinth.

II. Another View.

Johannes Weiss (*The History of Primitive Christianity*, i. 286 ff.) maintains that 2 Thessalonians was written prior to 1 Thessalonians. This view has been taken up and expanded somewhat by F. J. Badcock (*The Pauline Epistles*, 46 ff.).

Starting with the fact that 2 Thessalonians seems to have been written under greater strain than 1 Thessalonians, and adding to that the fact that certain Christians had died before 1 Thessalonians was written—but apparently not before 2 Thessalonians—these scholars argue that the organization presupposed in 1 Th 5^{12} would necessitate a certain amount of time. Thus it seems probable that 2 Thessalonians was the first to be written.

With this in mind, Badcock's historical reconstruction is as follows: When Paul left Thessalonica he went to Berœa. While there, certain reports came to him from Thessalonica, making necessary the writing of 2 Thessalonians. Late in the year A.D. 50, Timothy took this letter from Berœa to Thessalonica. Meanwhile Paul went to Athens and on to Corinth. The next spring Timothy rejoined Paul at Corinth, at which time 1 Thessalonians was written and sent to Thessalonica. The difficulty involved in this view is that it seems to ignore Timothy's presence at Athens as implied in 1 Th 3^{1-3}.

III. A Further Statement.

The priority of 2 Thessalonians seems probable for the following reasons: (1) 2 Thessalonians is shorter than 1 Thessalonians and yet deals with the same problems as the First Epistle. It would seem more probable that 1 Thessalonians would be an elaboration of what had already been written than that 2 Thessalonians would be an abbreviated discussion of problems already faced in the First Epistle. This is one of the strongest arguments for the priority of Jude over 2 Peter, and it would seem to be valid here also. (2) The death of some members of the Thessalonian Church (1 Th $4^{13ff.}$) would point to some time having elapsed between the time of Paul's ministry there and the writing of 1 Thessalonians. (3) If Paul's stay in Thessalonica was brief, as it seems to have been, there would hardly have been time to set up the organization which is presupposed in 1 Th 5^{12-13}. This organization would have been established in the course of time, if the Epistle is of a later date.

With these and other considerations in mind, it is likely that 2 Thessalonians was the first to be written. Out of this comes the following historical reconstruction: Paul and Silas went from Thessalonica to Berœa, leaving Timothy at Thessalonica for a short time (Ac 17^{10}, where Timothy is not mentioned). After trouble had arisen in Berœa through the work of Paul's enemies, Paul went ahead to Athens, where he was joined by Timothy and Silas (2 Th 1^{1}, 1 Th 3^{1-3}), possibly after they had revisited Thessalonica, or, at least, after they had heard some reports of the Christians there. To deal with the problems which had arisen in the Church at Thessalonica, Paul wrote 2 Thessalonians at Athens, and sent it to the Church at the hands of Timothy. While Timothy was on this mission, and while Silas was on a similar mission somewhere else in Macedonia (as implied from Ac 18^{5}), Paul went to Corinth. To Corinth Timothy brought his report along with certain further questions. These questions were answered in 1 Thessalonians, written at Corinth.

LYLE O. BRISTOL.

Toronto, Canada.

Entre Nous.

Industrial Chaplains.

In the supplement to *The Christian News-Letter* for 8th March there is an interesting article by Michael Dean on 'The Parson and the Factory.' The article deals naturally with the great opportunities this new sphere offers to the right man. But it deals much more largely with the difficulties and dangers that beset the work and the worker.

The first barrier is the interview with the Works Council or the Joint Production Committee or the Management. If they like the look of the Padre he will probably get his chance. But then he faces his real difficulties. How and when is he to

talk to the men? He must not interfere with production, and if the men are on piece-work any interruption means something off their pay-packet. Again, the greatest danger of all is that the chaplain may be regarded as the tool of the Management, 'a boss's man.' Few ministers realize how strong is the suspicion of everything the Management does. Further, the chaplain has to realize that 'Christianity has a bad reputation to live down in the works.' In too many works a selfish employer, or a manager with little regard for his men, is known to be a Christian. And the religion of such working men as claim to be Christians is of a narrow type which does not commend itself to their mates.

The authority of the Church counts for nothing in the factories, and the idea that a chaplain would be helped in his contacts with the workers by being officially commissioned by his Church is a delusion. A chaplain must stand on his own merits. He must not depend on any official status. He must not go into the works on 'the Management's ticket' alone, or ignore the Union officials or the shop stewards.

But, with all these difficulties, the chance is a magnificent one. There is an immense amount of ignorance to be removed, and a lot of misunderstanding both of what Christianity is and what the Church stands for. Also, this opportunity comes at a time when great changes are taking place in industry itself. Planning, changes in control, relocation of industry are bringing about a new Industrial Revolution. We can trace back many of the difficulties in the relations of the Church and the worker to-day to the apathy of the churches towards the profound changes in society which the earlier Industrial Revolution was effecting. To-day the industrial chaplain has an opportunity of helping to establish a new relation of confidence. But he must be the right man, with common sense and with a broad outlook on the proper approach he is to make. The right approach is often not that of evangelism or pastoral work but through a clear insight into the issues of freedom and justice which are involved in the organization and development of contemporary industry. Also, and perhaps above all, the chaplain must be willing to learn—about the worker, his needs and interests and outlook, about the organization of the factory and the problems facing industry to-day, and much else. Then he will do his job, which is to help both Management and workers towards a living faith and towards facing their responsibilities as Christian men.

F. J. Rae.

After the War.

In *The Century of the Common Man* we have a fine volume of 'Commencement' speeches by Mr. Henry A. Wallace, the Vice-President of the United States. In one of these he tells the story of 'George'—'a close friend of mine for eight years.'

'George was a pacifist almost of the Quaker type, and the dignity of the individual, regardless of race, creed, or colour, meant everything to him. But he was strong physically, an excellent football player, and a good wrestler, and he had a complete disdain for physical fear. We talked.

'I told him I disagreed with him, and why.

'George remained a pacifist in his heart, but he became a convert to the necessity of using physical force to fight this particular evil. He was in his second year at a Quaker college when the Japanese attacked at Pearl Harbour. He at once determined to put his strong body and alert mind at the disposition of his Government in one of the most dangerous services possible. He wanted to become a dive bomber in the Marines.

'In a letter written shortly before he was killed, George said: "It's after the war that the real fight will start. . . . This war is our job, and we are going to win it on the battle fronts, come hell or high water. The really tough job is going to begin after the war, when the same forces that got us into this one will be pitted against the men who've got the guts to fight for a world in which everybody can have a chance to do useful work. We kids are depending on you older men not to let this thing happen again. What we're fighting for now must not die in an armistice."

'Through George's meteoric life and symbolic death I was forced into a more complete appreciation of the meaning of the death of Christ to His disciples. Something bright and shining and full of hope had passed from the world. It just couldn't be. Death couldn't end all. Christ must live. He must live in the world for ever. Somewhere there must be a perpetual song of resurrection, ringing forth continuously the message of peace and good will.

'May many Georges live to hold my generation to account in building the peace, and to build upon that peace in such a way that the Georges of thirty years hence will treat, with reverence and love, the sacred values brought for them by death.'

Albert Schweitzer.

Messrs. A. & C. Black have sent us the following note about the literary work that Schweitzer is now engaged on. 'In your appreciative review [April number] of *Albert Schweitzer: His Work and Philosophy*, by Oskar Kraus, reference is made in the past tense to Schweitzer as a philosopher. We fear this may lead some of your readers to assume that his work is done, and we would like to say that in such time as he can spare after the day's round in his hospital at Lambarene he is now revising the final draft of the third and fourth volumes of his *Philosophy of Civilization*. Provisionally these are titled respectively *The World-View of Reverence for Life* and *The Civilized State*, and we hope to publish them as soon as may be after the war.'

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.